

THE
UNITED STATES AND THE WAR
THE MISSION TO RUSSIA
POLITICAL ADDRESSES

BY
ELIHU ROOT

COLLECTED AND EDITED BY

ROBERT BACON
AND
JAMES BROWN SCOTT



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1918

**COPYRIGHT, 1918
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

CONTENTS

	<small>PAGE</small>
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	vii
THE UNITED STATES AND THE WAR	1
THE ENSLAVEMENT OF THE BELGIANS	3
An Address at a mass meeting in New York, December 15, 1916.	
AMERICA'S PRESENT NEEDS	11
An Address at the Congress of Constructive Patriotism, held under the auspices of the National Security League, Washington, January 25, 1917.	
AMERICA ON TRIAL	27
An Address before the Union League Club, New York, March 20, 1917.	
THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD CRISIS	33
An Address as chairman of a patriotic mass meeting, Madison Square Garden, New York, March 22, 1917.	
THE DUTY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN THE WAR	39
A Speech before the New York Republican Club, April 9, 1917.	
GERMANY, RUSSIA, AND THE UNITED STATES	45
An Address before the Union League Club, New York, August 15, 1917.	
A FEDERATED UNION OF THE AMERICAN BAR	57
An Address at the special conference of delegates from the American Bar Association, and delegates from state and local bar associations, Saratoga Springs, New York, September 3, 1917.	
THE AMERICAN BAR AND THE WAR	63
Resolutions of the American Bar Association, Saratoga Springs, New York, September 4, 1917.	
THE WAR AND DISCUSSION	65
An Address at a war mass meeting in the Coliseum, Chicago, September 14, 1917.	
JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES	81
An Address at a luncheon in honor of the Imperial Japanese Mission, New York, October 1, 1917.	

THE MISSION TO RUSSIA	87
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	89
Letter to Charles R. Flint, March 24, 1917.	
Letter to Augustus Thomas, April 17, 1917.	
ADDRESS TO THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS	98
Petrograd, June 15, 1917.	
REPLY OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	101
ADDRESS BEFORE THE RUSSIAN-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	105
Petrograd, June 21, 1917.	
ADDRESS BEFORE THE SOCIAL ASSOCIATED COMMITTEES OF MOSCOW, June 22, 1917	109
ADDRESS BEFORE THE MOSCOW DUMA, June 22, 1917 . . .	111
ADDRESS BEFORE THE WAR INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE AT MOSCOW, June 23, 1917	117
ADDRESS BEFORE THE ZEMSTVO UNION AT MOSCOW, June 23, 1917	123
ADDRESS AT THE MOSCOW PEOPLE'S BANK, June 23, 1917	125
ADDRESS AT THE MEETING OF THE BOURSE OF MOSCOW, June 23, 1917	127
ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY GENERAL BRUSILOFF . .	130
General Staff Headquarters, "Stafka," June 27, 1917.	
ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	132
Petrograd, July 4, 1917.	
ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON OF THE AMERICAN CLUB . . .	136
Petrograd, July 6, 1917.	
ADDRESS AT A MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF LIQUIDATION OF THE AFFAIRS OF POLAND	142
Petrograd, July 7, 1917.	
ADDRESS BEFORE A LARGE BODY OF RUSSIAN SOLDIERS .	145
Perm, July 13, 1917.	
ADDRESS BEFORE A GATHERING OF SOLDIERS AND CITIZENS .	147
Nazuvaeskaya, July 14, 1917.	
ADDRESS AT A RECEPTION BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE, August 4, 1917	149

CONTENTS

v

ADDRESS AT A RECEPTION BY THE CITY OF NEW YORK, August 15, 1917	154
FAITH IN RUSSIA	161
An Address at a reception of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York, August 15, 1917.	
SYMPATHY WITH RUSSIA	169
An Address at the banquet of the American Bar Association, Saratoga Springs, New York, September 7, 1917.	
POLITICAL ADDRESSES	183
THE CAMPAIGN OF 1904	185
An Address at Buffalo, New York, October 22, 1904.	
THE DEMAGOGUE IN POLITICS	203
An Address in the campaign of 1906, Utica, New York, November 1, 1906.	
THE CAMPAIGN OF 1908	227
An Address at the Republican State Convention, Saratoga Springs, New York, September 14, 1908.	
THE NEW YORK STATE CAMPAIGN OF 1910	259
An Address at Manhattan Casino, New York, October 28, 1910.	
THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS	277
An Address at the Republican National Convention, Chicago, June 18, 1912.	
THE RENOMINATION OF PRESIDENT TAFT	297
An Address as chairman of the Republican National Con- vention of 1912, notifying Mr. Taft of his nomination, Wash- ington, August 1, 1912.	
THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN OPPOSITION	301
An Address at the Republican State Convention, Saratoga Springs, New York, August 18, 1914.	
THE CAMPAIGN OF 1916	323
An Address at a public meeting held under the direction of the Republican Club, New York, October 5, 1916.	
INDEX	351

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE collected addresses and state papers of Elihu Root, of which this is one of several volumes, cover the period of his service as Secretary of War, as Secretary of State, and as Senator of the United States, during which time, to use his own expression, his only client was his country.

The many formal and occasional addresses and speeches, which will be found to be of a remarkably wide range, are followed by his state papers, such as the instructions to the American delegates to the Second Hague Peace Conference and other diplomatic notes and documents, prepared by him as Secretary of State in the performance of his duties as an executive officer of the United States. Although the official documents have been kept separate from the other papers, this plan has been slightly modified in the volume devoted to the military and colonial policy of the United States, which includes those portions of his official reports as Secretary of War throwing light upon his public addresses and his general military policy.

The addresses and speeches selected for publication are not arranged chronologically, but are classified in such a way that each volume contains addresses and speeches relating to a general subject and a common purpose. The addresses as president of the American Society of International Law show his treatment of international questions from the theoretical standpoint, and in the light of his experience as Secretary of War and as Secretary of State, unrestrained and uncontrolled by the limitations of official position, whereas his addresses on foreign affairs, delivered while Secretary of State or as United States Senator, discuss these questions under the reserve of official responsibility.

Mr. Root's addresses on government, citizenship, and legal procedure are a masterly exposition of the principles of the Constitution and of the government established by it; of the duty of the citizen to understand the Constitution and to conform his conduct to its requirements; and of the right of the people to reform or to amend the Constitution in order to make representative government more effective and responsive to their present and future needs. The addresses on law and its administration state how legal procedure should be modified and simplified in the interest of justice rather than in the supposed interest of the legal profession.

The addresses delivered during the trip to South America and Mexico in 1906, and in the United States after his return, with their message of good will, proclaim a new doctrine — the Root doctrine — of kindly consideration and of honorable obligation, and make clear the destiny common to the peoples of the Western World.

The addresses and the reports on military and colonial policy made by Mr. Root as Secretary of War explain the reorganization of the army after the Spanish-American War, the creation of the General Staff, and the establishment of the Army War College. They trace the origin of and give the reason for the policy of this country in Cuba, the Philippines, and Porto Rico, devised and inaugurated by him. It is not generally known that the so-called Platt Amendment, defining our relations to Cuba, was drafted by Mr. Root, and that the Organic Act of the Philippines was likewise the work of Mr. Root as Secretary of War.

The argument before The Hague Tribunal in the North Atlantic Fisheries Case is a rare if not the only instance of a statesman appearing as chief counsel in an international arbitration, which, as Secretary of State, he had prepared and submitted.

The miscellaneous addresses, including educational, historical, and commemorative addresses, the political speeches in days of peace, and the stirring and prophetic utterances in anticipation of and during our war with Germany, delivered at home and on special mission in Russia, should make known to future generations the literary, artistic, and emotional side of this broad-minded and far-seeing statesman of our time.

The publication of these collected addresses and state papers will, it is believed, enable the American people better to understand the generation in which Mr. Root has been a commanding figure, and better to appreciate during his lifetime the services which he has rendered to his country.

ROBERT BACON.

JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1917.

**THE UNITED STATES AND
THE WAR**

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF THE BELGIANS

ADDRESS AT A MASS MEETING IN NEW YORK CITY
DECEMBER 15, 1916

I AM glad to join my voice tonight with my fellows in this free land in condemnation and protest against this new outrage that is visited upon poor and bleeding Belgium.

I could not remain silent. I should not respect myself if I remained silent, and I hope, I trust, I pray, that my country will not remain silent.

Explain it as you may, excuse it as you may, disguise it as you may, the people of Belgium by the tens and hundreds of thousands are being carried away into slavery, — a thing that has not been done by any nation that claimed to be civilized in modern history.

Poor Belgium, peaceful, industrious, God-fearing, law-abiding Belgium, she had no quarrel with any one; she sought no nation's territory; she coveted no neighbor's goods; she threatened no one's security, but she stood in the way of a mightier nation's purpose, — and she was stricken to the earth! Her firm, her stern and noble resolve to keep the faith was her only crime, and she has been punished as if her people were the vilest on earth. Her towns have been burned, her noble and stately monuments have been leveled to the earth; her women and children and old men have been murdered; her country has been brought under the sway of a foreign invader, and she has been bled white by vast exactions of money and of produce. Every effort to revive her industries has been denied, and now, because she has suffered thus, her men are to be carried away to forced labor as slaves.

If the civilized world of the twentieth century is willing to stand silent and see these things done, in cumulative progression, in violation of the laws of humanity and of nations, then the civilization of the twentieth century is worse than the savagery of Roman times.

It seems that there is no place for the independence of small, weak states, for security in self-government by peaceable and unarmed peoples, or for individual freedom, or for private right, in that scheme of things under which "liberty for national evolution" is to justify all uses of power.

But what we have to do is not merely to gratify our own feelings, by expressing them regarding this treatment of the Belgians. What we have to do is not merely to protest in the name of humanity, — it is to assert a right, it is to call upon the world to assert a right, a right under the law of nations for the protection of humanity and of civilization. This is our concern. This deportation of the Belgians to involuntary servitude is a violation of our law, of the law we helped to make, of the law which in common with all civilized nations we have built up generation after generation, and it has been embodied in definite and certain and solemn instruments of agreement, as to what humanity demands, signed by Belgium, signed by Germany, and binding today. I see that General von Bissing justifies the deportation of Belgian workmen and refers to the Hague Convention as to the basis for his action, quoting the provision that it is the duty of a belligerent power, in possession of conquered territory, to preserve order. The deportation, he says, was to preserve order in Belgium. Let me read the whole of the provision to which he refers:

The authority of the legitimate power, having actually passed into the hands of the occupant, the latter shall take all steps in his power to reestablish and insure as far as possible public order and safety, while respecting, unless absolutely prevented, the laws in force in the country.

The most solemn of the laws of Belgium, protecting the rights of her people, were violated in contravention of that very provision by the man who appeals to it for his justification.

What I read was from Article 43 of the 1899 convention of the First Hague Conference. The convention proceeds:

Family honors and rights, individual lives, and private property, as well as religious convictions, and liberty, must be respected.

The convention further proceeds:

Until a more complete code of the laws of war is issued, the high contracting parties have the right to declare that in cases not included in the regulations adopted by them, populations and belligerents remain under the protection and empire of the principles of international law as they result from the usages established between civilized nations, the laws of humanity, and the requirements of public conscience.

That convention was signed and ratified by every Power that is now engaged in the European war, as well as by ourselves. There was a subsequent convention that was signed by nearly all, which contained a provision that as to those that did not sign, the convention from which I read continued in force. The subsequent convention contained precisely identical provisions, so that Germany is bound in conscience and in law by the existing treaty between her and us, between her and Belgium, declaring what the principles of humanity require in the treatment of occupied territory. Those principles of humanity have been violated in accordance with the very statement of them upon which she and we have agreed.

Now, I say this law is our law; it is our protection. The rights of man, peace and humanity, cannot be preserved upon impulse alone. Law governing men in the treatment of the weak and defenseless is necessary; and so for years, for centuries, the nations have been building up a code of law, international law, and that law is the protection — the

enforcement of that law, respect for that law, obedience to that law, are the protection of our peaceable people, of all weak and small nations, of all those that do not wish to be armed to the teeth every moment for their own protection.

We have a right to have it observed, and it is our duty to our children and to our country that we shall not remain silent in the face of open, flagrant, contemptuous disregard and violation of it.

How can it be preserved? Not merely by armies and navies. No. There is but one power on earth that can preserve the law for the protection of the poor, the weak and the humble; there is but one power on earth that can preserve the law for the maintenance of civilization and humanity, and that is the power, the mighty power, of the public opinion of mankind!

Without it, your leagues to enforce peace, your societies for a world's court, your peace conventions, your peace endowments, are all powerless, because no force moves in this world unless it ultimately has public opinion behind it.

The thing that men fear more than they do the sheriff or the policeman or the state's prison is the condemnation of the community in which they live.

The thing that among nations is the most potent force is the universal condemnation of mankind. And even during this terrible struggle we have seen the nations appealing from day to day, appealing by speech and by pen and by press for favorable judgment from mankind, the public opinion of the world. That opinion establishes standards of conduct. In Roman times, the standard of conduct permitted the carrying off of slaves to the mines; permitted the impaling of prisoners; permitted the sacking of towns. At the time of the Thirty Years' War, outrages almost as bad as those which have been perpetrated in Belgium were in accord with the practice and acquiescence of the world; but we thought that

we had been building up new standards of conduct, that the world had grown more compassionate, and more kindly, and it had. The public opinion of the world was establishing, had established, a more humane and Christian standard of conduct, both in peace and in war. That standard is now beaten down, it is destroyed, it is set at naught. And if we remain silent, if the great neutral peoples of the world remain silent, the standard is gone forever.

And, mark this, the new standard, or rather, the return to the old standard of barbarism will not stop with the poor people of Belgium. It will be here! Not perhaps for you and me, but for our children it will be here.

How can we maintain the standard of civilization? Not by silence regarding international wrong. If the world of well meaning and kindly and good people remain silent when hideous wrong is done, what difference is there to the wrong-doer between right and wrong? In order that the public opinion of the world should be worth anything, it must condemn wrong.

And that is what we are called upon to do now. I have thought it should be done before, but now there can be no doubt. I say that the mightiest power that man knows, is ready to be awakened and brought to bear for the prevention of such crimes in the future, provided we and others like us are true to our duty and speak out in condemnation of horrid crimes. America cannot choose at will. We have made professions, we have assumed an attitude, we have taken upon ourselves responsibility, we have declared ourselves the champions of freedom. Ah! Remember across the half-century, the words of Lincoln: "Four score and seven years ago our Fathers brought forth upon this Continent a new nation conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." They came here across the stormy seas in their little boats and braved the rigors of

winter and the perils of savage foes that they might be free. Some of us remember how they gave their lives that the blacks might be free. It was the spirit of freedom that took the pioneers across the mountains and the plains and the rivers, and gave this vast continent to the reign of law and justice and peace. We have cherished ideals, we have had dreams, we have had ideals of a world made better and happier and nobler because America was a free democracy. We cannot remain silent now while these poor Belgians, without fault, are carried into slavery, without abjuring our past, and being false to our country.

Land where my fathers died,
Land of the Pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain side,
Let Freedom ring!

Our fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright,
With Freedom's holy light.

One cannot be an American, with the history of America, without responsibility, and that responsibility confronts the people of our country today to protect the spirit of American freedom. We have grown rich beyond the dreams of avarice. So prosperous, so many millions of automobiles, such palaces, such comforts, such luxury! Intellect has been trained, education spread broadcast over the land, peace preserved! Ah! Are we so sunk in comfort and luxury and self-satisfaction, that we have lost the old spirit of American freedom?

If we have not, we shall not dare remain silent over this latest wrong to Belgium.

Let me read the effective words of that great-hearted and noble prelate, whose message, appealing to all that is best in humanity throughout the world, fearless of the mighty power

that seeks to constrain him, will make the name of Cardinal Mercier great in history. Let me read from his pathetic appeal:

We, the shepherds of these sheep who are torn from us by brutal force, full of anguish at the thought of the moral and religious isolation in which they are about to languish, impotent witnesses of the grief and terror in the numerous homes shattered or threatened, appeal to all souls, believers or unbelievers, in allied countries, in neutral countries, and even in enemy countries, who have a respect for human dignity. May Divine Providence deign to inspire all who have any authority, all who are masters of speech and pen, to rally round our humble Belgian flag for the abolition of European slavery.

Thank Heaven our President has assumed the leadership of the free opinion of the American democracy, and has spoken for it to Germany. All honor to him for it, and it is for us to say, as I for my part say, that we will stand by him, support him, approve him in maintaining the application of the free principles of America in insisting upon respect and obedience to the law which protects all weak and peaceable nations, and in protesting, with all the power of the hundred millions of America against the outrage upon humanity which has been done.

We may not be, in the words of Cardinal Mercier, "masters of speech and pen", but we are masters of our souls, and we are part of the great self-governing people of America, and we can speak, and we can speak so clear and high that the world will hear it, and that all right-minded and compassionate men and women will follow it and will join with us until the voice of the public opinion of the world will satisfy the most hard-hearted tyrant of them all that wrongs such as these are punished by the universal condemnation of mankind.

AMERICA'S PRESENT NEEDS

ADDRESS AT THE CONGRESS OF CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM
HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY
LEAGUE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25, 1917

I FIND that I am set down upon the program to speak upon America's present needs. I should not have dignified the few remarks that I have to make by any such stupendous title. I will make one observation, however, upon the subject. It is that America's present need is a re-awakening of the spirit of a free self-governing democracy. And unless we are to wait until some great and terrible misfortune brings that awakening, each one of us, whose eyes are open to the condition and the demands of the times, must do his utmost to render his service and awaken his fellows.

Now I wish I could say something — I would like to say something, not so much to lead or to convince you, whose eyes are already open, and who have come here because they are open, but something that will enable you, when you go home, to stir your fellow-countrymen, men and women, out of the lethargy into which they have fallen, a lethargy in which they assume that liberty and justice come as the air, without effort and need no service and no sacrifice for their perpetuation, a lethargy in which the more material things of life fill the needs and the wants, and to have a fat and increasing income and swell the millions of automobiles in the country, seems to be the mission of the American Republic. We have reached this condition of indifference and sluggish patriotism through decadence. As life has grown easier sacrifice has grown harder. As we have grown rich in material things we have grown poor in spirit.

The original theory of our American government was the theory of universal service. Let me read you how the fathers of the Republic conceived that American independence and American freedom were to be preserved. I read from the Militia Act of May 8, 1792 — and you will perceive here that the Act is based upon the principle of universal compulsory preparation for public defense. The quaint old phrases of the Act may serve to impress upon your minds the changes of condition to which the principle is to be applied, while they may serve to enforce the memory of the principle. These are its provisions:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each and every free able-bodied white male citizen of the respective states, resident therein, who is or shall be of the age of eighteen years, and under the age of forty-five years . . . shall severally and respectively be enrolled in the militia by the captain, or commanding officer of the company, within whose bounds such citizen shall reside, and that within twelve months after the passing of this act. And it shall at all times hereafter be the duty of every such captain or commanding officer of a company to enrol every such citizen, as aforesaid, and also those who shall, from time to time, arrive at the age of eighteen years, or being of the age of eighteen years and under the age of forty-five years . . . shall come to reside within his bounds; and shall without delay notify such citizen of the said enrolment, by a proper non-commissioned officer of the company, by whom such notice may be proved. That every citizen so enrolled and notified, shall, within six months thereafter, provide himself with a good musket or firelock, a sufficient bayonet and belt, two spare flints, and a knapsack, a pouch with a box therein to contain not less than twenty-four cartridges, suited to the bore of his musket or firelock, each cartridge to contain a proper quantity of powder and ball: or with a good rifle, knapsack, shot-pouch and powder-horn, twenty balls suited to the bore of his rifle, and a quarter of a pound of powder; and shall appear, so armed, accoutred and provided, when called out to exercise, or into service, except, that when called out on company days to exercise only, he may appear without a knapsack. That the commissioned officers shall severally be armed with a sword or hanger and espontoon, and that from and after five years from the passing of this act, all muskets for arming the militia as herein required, shall be of bores sufficient for balls of the eighteenth part of a pound. And every citizen so enrolled, and providing himself with the arms, ammunition and accoutrements required as afore-

said, shall hold the same exempted from all suits, distresses, executions or sales, for debt or for the payment of taxes. . . .

And be it further enacted, That within one year after the passing of this act, the militia of the respective states shall be arranged into divisions, brigades, regiments, battalions, and companies, as the legislature of each state shall direct. . . .

And be it further enacted, That there shall be an adjutant-general appointed in each state, whose duty it shall be to distribute all orders from the commander-in-chief of the state to the several corps; to attend all public reviews when the commander-in-chief of the state shall review the militia, or any part thereof; to obey all orders from him relative to carrying into execution and perfecting the system of military discipline established by this act; to furnish blank forms of different returns that may be required, and to explain the principles on which they should be made; to receive from the several officers of the different corps throughout the state, returns of the militia under their command, reporting the actual situation of their arms, accoutrements, and ammunition, their delinquencies, and every other thing which relates to the general advancement of good order and discipline: all which the several officers of the divisions, brigades, regiments, and battalions, are hereby required to make in the usual manner, so that the said adjutant-general may be duly furnished therewith: from all which returns he shall make proper abstracts, and lay the same annually before the commander-in-chief of the state.

And be it further enacted, That the rules of discipline, approved and established by Congress in their resolution of the twenty-ninth of March, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-nine, shall be the rules of discipline to be observed by the militia throughout the United States, except such deviations from the said rules as may be rendered necessary by the requisitions of this act, or by some other unavoidable circumstances. It shall be the duty of the commanding officer at every muster, whether by battalion, regiment, or single company, to cause the militia to be exercised and trained agreeably to the said rules of discipline.¹

Now, what we are talking about in the meetings that have led up to this congress is a return to the original basic principle upon which this government was founded. There were rapid changes in conditions after this old, early Act. We gradually became relieved of the pressure of contiguous possible enemies. With the purchase of Louisiana in 1803 the France of Napoleon disappeared from our border. With

¹ *U. S. Statutes at Large*, Vol. I, pp. 271-273.

the acquisition of Florida in 1819, Spain withdrew from the continental limits of the present United States, and we no longer looked at Spanish soldiers across an imaginary border line. With the settlement of the Northeastern boundary controversy, in the Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842, and with the Oregon boundary settlement in 1846, all cause of controversy with Great Britain upon our northern frontier disappeared. With the gradual pressing out of the settlers, occupation of Indian lands, and pressing back of the Indians, the danger of the Indian wars to the great settled states upon the Atlantic seaboard became far distant, and that great race question which agitated the men of the early days disappeared. We grew in numbers vastly and became so numerous that for any of the ordinary wars as they occurred in the nineteenth century, it seemed unnecessary that all the people of all the states should hold themselves prepared in accordance with the principles of this Act of 1792. Enough could be raised at any time to constitute an army of the size which was customary for the wars of that period. The spirit of adventure would lead young men enough to come to the front to engage in ordinary small wars, like, for instance, the Mexican War. And, finally, we came to the point where all this duty was completely changed, and the old militia service disappeared. About fourteen years ago a new experiment was tried. During this period of the gradual occultation of militia service the states had found that they needed some organized force for what was practically police duty, and from that need the National Guard arose. It was not that the states expected to engage in war with anybody, but because they must have an organized force; and about fourteen years ago the effort was made to utilize that organized force as a means of furnishing instruction to young Americans which would give them, in case they were called to volunteer for military service, the A B C of that service. In all our

wars we have suffered dreadfully from the fact that outside of the small regular army our volunteers had to be officered by men taken out of the workshop, the law office, the store, the farm; good men, but wholly, wholly untrained in military life and military duty; and no one can measure the loss of life which occurred in our Civil War because the young men who were sent on to the battlefields were led by officers wholly ignorant of their duties.

The attempt then was made to treat the National Guard as an organized militia, to require its organization, its discipline, its armament, to conform to that of the regular army, give it instructors from the regular army, have it exercise in maneuvers and in camps with the regular army and contribute out of the national treasury towards its support and instruction, and that process has been going on for the last fourteen years.

It now appears, however, I think with great certainty, that that process cannot produce more than a comparatively small number of men who are trained so that they have even the elements of military service. The National Guard has not increased very much during the whole period that has elapsed since the so-called Dick Act that made the arrangements for this joint instruction and joint exercise.

So we find ourselves in this situation, that we have not yet secured any real substitute for the old universal service that is adequate to any very great military operation. But, in the meantime, the science of war has changed, and the relations of armies and navies to the other peoples of the earth have changed so that we have an entirely new and different problem. In the old days nations used to send out armies, composed of but a very small part of the population, and those armies used to look for each other and fight each other, and, when they got through, there would be a peace made, which would result in some little changes, sometimes of

consequence and sometimes of very little consequence, but the great mass of the people were not very much affected. The great mass of the people took but little part in it.

But, now, war has become a conflict of entire nations against each other and we see today the whole people of England and the whole people of France and the whole people of Germany and of Austria, engaged in actual participation in the conflict. Now, with that kind of war, our little provision of a small regular army and a small National Guard is entirely incompetent to deal. We have already discovered that we cannot get any considerable increase through volunteering. There are not enough with all the interest in preparation for defense, to fill up the ranks of our regular army or to fill up the ranks of our National Guard. The reason is that the spirit of adventure is not adequate to furnish the soldiers.

That same thing has proven true before. In 1812 we had to come to a draft. We tried to fight that war with volunteers, volunteers in the regulars and volunteers in the militia, and we were unable to do it and we came to a draft and we made a terrible mess of it. In the Civil War we had to come to a draft. We tried to fight it with volunteers. The South appreciated the difficulty in 1862 and started on a draft then. We waited until 1863, when we took recourse to conscription. Whenever the real stresses come, since we have abandoned the old universal system of this Act of 1792, the volunteer system has proved to be insufficient to answer the purpose. And now, a thousand times more, will it be incompetent when whole nations engage in war.

War is changing in another respect. It has become vastly more scientific and the instruments of warfare have gone out of sight from the old hanger and spontoon of the Act of 1792. High explosives and machine guns, and breech-loading cannons, and great field pieces that are sufficient to batter down

the mightiest fortifications, and submarines, and airships, and deadly gases, and spurting flames, and scores of other devices of science, have created a situation in which this volunteer million which is going to rise up when the President calls for the defense of America, stand no more chance against a disciplined and trained army than the poor Mexicans did against Cortez, when he went through Mexico; or than the American Indians with their bows and arrows stood against the regulars that drove them step by step from their ancient possessions. We would be today, if engaged in war, with our million patriots, in the position of the helpless savage fighting against the trained forces of civilization.

It is not necessary to come even to this time for that, for here we should remember, when we are talking about the defense of country, how the British troops captured Washington and burned the Capitol and White House, marching from the Chesapeake here against an American army many times their number. Why? These men, whom Madison drove out to see and in front of whose rout he drove rapidly back, were the sons of the men who fought at Bunker Hill and Saratoga and Yorktown, and they were the fathers of the men who fought at Gettysburg and Shiloh. They were as brave, as manly, as their fathers or their sons, but they fled before a force of men of the same race, far, far inferior in number. Why? Because they did not know how to fight. They were as helpless as a sheep before a wolf. They did not know how. A little training beforehand would have taught them how.

Now there is one other thing of vast importance and that is, that not only must men learn how, but they must be supplied. Armies must have food and shoes and clothes, and rifles to take the place of those that are broken and lost, and ammunition to take the place of that which is fired away, and cannons, and all the vast range of scientific appliances

with which they may hold their own in battle. They must be transported. The high explosives require the use of many, many ingredients, not common. All of this vast supply, this supply upon which one-half the world is engaged today while the other half is using it in war, this vast supply must be provided from raw materials, and, in order that it may be made, people must know how to make it and must be trained in making it. And so there must be industrial training, industrial organization, industrial preparation, as well as the provision of men. And beyond all that, when war comes, people have got to live. The industrial and financial processes of the country have got to go on, and if they are to go on notwithstanding the vastly disturbing forces of war, which break up all the common usual relations and occupations, people have got to be trained in industry. They have got to have the spirit of industry. They have got to have the spirit which will lead them to work although they are no longer making profits. They have got to have the spirit which will lead them to exercise their industry to do what they can, each in his way and in her way, to continue the life of the country, because they wish to serve their country. That means, not merely the organization of an army, but it means the organization of a nation. No army and no nation can be effectively organized unless the spirit is within it which gives it motive power.

Well, now, why all this? Why need we disturb ourselves? I think that is the great trouble. I think that the great obstacle you men and women of this conference have to meet in the country is the fact that a great mass of the people of the country do not believe a word of it, do not believe there is any necessity of our talking about it, do not believe the trouble is ever going to come. To be sure, we have had wars all along, one in a little over every twenty years during our entire history. It is nineteen years now since the last, and

we are due to have one pretty soon. But they do not believe that anything is going to happen. Now that is the trouble with preparation. If the people of the United States thought that there was any real danger of somebody's attacking us they would wake up soon enough and get ready. But they do not. So they turn the cows out to pasture and are no more disturbed about things than the cows. Well, let us look at the condition of affairs in the world. We did think that things were getting better. We had high hopes that the forces that make for peace, the public opinion of civilized man, and the values to civilized man of uninterrupted commerce were continually making war less probable. But we have had a rude awakening.

The present war which is raging in Europe was begun upon an avowal of principles of national action that no reasonable and thoughtful neutral ought to ignore. The central principle was that a state exigency, state interest, is superior to those rules of morality which control individuals. Now that was not an expedient, an excuse, seized upon to justify the beginning of the war; it is fundamental. The theory of the modern republic is that right begins with the individual. It was stated in the Declaration of Independence, that instrument which it was the fashion to sneer at a few years ago, but which states the fundamental principle upon which alone a free republic can live. It was that individual men have unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted to secure those rights. The ancient theory, the theory alike of monarchies and of the ancient republics upon which they went down to their ruin, was that the state in the beginning was the foundation of right, and that individuals derive their rights from the state, and therefore, the exigencies of the state are superior to all individual rights. It was upon the continuance and assertion of that principle that this war

in Europe was begun. And upon that principle it was declared that there was no obligation upon a nation to keep the faith of a treaty if it did not suit its interests. It was declared that there was no obligation upon a nation to observe the rules of that law of nations upon which all civilized states have agreed, if it did not suit its interest. Now mark, I am not discussing the right or wrong, I am stating the principle of action which was followed and which was asserted to be right. Upon that principle little Servia received an ultimatum that demanded the surrender of her independence; and upon her failure to comply to the uttermost, she was overwhelmed. Upon that principle little Belgium that had no quarrel with anybody was served with a demand that she surrender her independent rights as a neutral and violate her solemn agreements to preserve her neutrality; and upon her refusal to surrender her rights and violate her faith, she was overwhelmed. And that principle is still maintained and asserted to be right. I repeat that I am not referring to this for the purpose of discussing it, I am referring to it because it bears directly upon our business here today. It does not matter much what you and I think about these things; it does not matter that I think they were immoral and criminal, as I do; it does not matter that I think that if that principle of national conduct is to be maintained and approved in this world, then liberty and civilization must die. What does matter is that approximately one-half the entire military power of this world supports that proposition. And I say to you, and I wish I could say it to every American, if that principle of national conduct be approved in the struggle that is pending, be approved by the free people of America, be approved by the conscience of the civilized world, then our American freedom will surely die and die while we live.

The German note proposing a peace conference used a phrase which aptly describes the concrete application of the

principle about which I am talking. It said, "We were forced to take the sword for justice and for liberty of national evolution." Liberty of national evolution! It was national evolution that overran Servia. It was national evolution that crushed Belgium. And national evolution has not confined itself to the pathway to the Channel or to the pathway to the Bosphorus; it has extended over Asia and Africa, all over the world, except America, North and South, eager and grasping and resolute, gathering in under its flag, under domination, under national control, the territory of the earth.

All nations have been at fault during this last half-century. Many crimes have been committed; no nations that I know have been guiltless — none. Neither England, nor France, nor Russia, nor Germany, nor Austria, nor the United States. For we still have to answer for Mexico. But the world is partitioned — Asia, Africa, Australasia, the islands of the sea, all taken up — except America. And we stand here with the Monroe Doctrine, we stand here with the Monroe Doctrine against the push and sweep of that mighty world tendency of national evolution and its progress under the principle that neither faith of treaties nor obligation of law nor rule of morality should stand in the way of a state that finds its interest to take what it wants for its national interest. How long will the Monroe Doctrine be worth the paper it was written on in 1823 if that condition is to go on? That doctrine is that the safety of the United States forbids any foreign military power to obtain a foothold upon this continent from which it may readily make war upon the United States — that is the Monroe Doctrine — it is a declaration of what, in the opinion of the United States, is necessary for the safety of the United States. Now that doctrine is not international law. It has been maintained by three things. In the first place, the men of Monroe's time never thought of

such a thing as not being ready to fight for their rights. They were Belgians, those people. The second has been that the balance of power in Europe has been so even, so close, and everybody has been so doubtful about what the other fellows were going to do, that nobody found it worth while to take on a row with the United States. And third, England's fleet.

Now I ask what that Monroe Doctrine will be worth if we are not ready to protect it? Suppose the result of this war is such that these foreign influences that have helped preserve the Monroe Doctrine disappear, and we are not ready to defend it? Worthless! What will it mean if a foreign naval power, a real naval power, a real military power obtains a naval base in the Caribbean, or in those islands of the Pacific off Panama? Our interests in the Panama Canal will be as worthless to us as the Bosphorus is to Russia today. And instead of having what we have spent four hundred millions to accomplish, the means of transferring our navy from ocean to ocean, our navy will be shut up again on one side or the other of the continent. And then we will have to live as poor, peaceable France has lived for the last forty years, with a sentinel always on the lookout for an approaching foe. Then the fancied security and sweet, comfortable ease of our people will be replaced by alarms and rumors of war and attack upon occasion. For the Monroe Doctrine was based upon sound wisdom, and the abandonment of it or the destruction of it will be the end of our security.

It seems to me that we have reached a point now where we can say that a prudent man, a man competent to be a trustee of property, will see that it is necessary for us to prepare to defend our rights. For why should not this principle of national aggression be applied to us? Why should it not be applied to South and Central America and the West Indies? Here we all are, rich, undefended, supine — fair game for

anybody who wants national evolution. Can anybody tell why it should not? Interest and principle and habit all will conspire to a treatment of America like the treatment of China. And there is only one way possible for us to defend or be ready to defend our rights, and that is by going back to the old principle of universal preparation for service. We have found, beyond the possibility of question, that volunteering, however ready the people may be, will not answer the purpose, because nobody volunteers until war, and when the war comes it is too late for him to learn to do his duty. Nobody is volunteering now, nobody volunteers for the National Guard or the regular army, and nobody will until the war. It is a matter of demonstration that you cannot get together a volunteer force in time of peace so as to prepare them to render their service in time of war.

Now, going back to the matters which should lead a reasonable person to consider that there is a possibility of our being attacked, I want to call your attention to the way in which war comes. It does not come ordinarily by some country starting out a great fleet and a million men to go and invade another. It comes by a process of gradual aggression. What is going to happen to us if we do not get ready to defend our rights will be that first there will be one little aggression upon our rights — we will submit; there will be another little aggression, going a little farther, upon our rights, and we will submit; there will be another, and another, and another, and finally the patience of this great democracy will be worn out and they will clamor for war, and they will rush into war, unprepared for war. That is what is going to happen if we do not get ready. You cannot consider what men are going to do as if they were angels. Men are men, and greed and injustice and covetousness, and a desire to overrun the rights of others, stalk through the earth today as they did two thousand years ago. He who does not

defend his liberty is foolish and simple and unworthy of liberty.

Another thing: the President has recently made a speech in the Senate, which we have all been reading, and I wish you to observe that the only way he sees out of the war that is devastating Europe is by preparation for war. There is much noble idealism in that speech of the President. With its purpose I fully sympathize. The kind of peace he describes is the peace that I long for. But the way he sees to preserve that peace is by preparation for war. Now, if some of our friends among the corn-fields and the cotton-fields and the mines, and the citrous fruit orchards will sit up and read this clause of the President's speech, telling how we may prevent further wars, they may have reason to wonder whether they have not forgotten something. Here it is: "Mere agreement may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged, or any alliance hitherto formed or projected, that no nation, no probable combinations of nations, could face or withstand it. If the peace presently to be made is to endure it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind."

Now, I hope that paragraph means what I hope it does. I do not understand it as intended to commit the United States to enter into a convention or treaty with the other civilized countries of the world which will bind the United States to go to war on the continent of Europe or of Asia or in any other part of the world without the people of the United States having an opportunity at the time to say whether they will go to war or not. There would be serious difficulties, I think insurmountable obstacles, to the making of any such agreement. One is, that agreement or no agreement, when the time comes the people of the United States will not go into

any war, and nobody can get them into any war, unless they then are in favor of fighting for something. And nothing can be so bad as to make a treaty and then break it. What I understand by it is, that a convention shall be made by which all the civilized nations shall agree with all their power to stand behind the maintenance of the peace thus agreed upon, and if that peace be infringed upon then each nation shall determine what it is its duty to do under the obligation of that agreement towards the maintenance of that peace. But observe that that is worthless, meaningless, unless the nations that enter into it keep the power behind it. It will be worthless agreement on our part if we have not a ship or a soldier that we can contribute to the war, if war there ought to be, for the maintenance of that peace. And it absolutely requires that we shall build up a force, a potential power of arms, commensurate with our size, our numbers, our wealth, our dignity, our part among the nations of the earth.

There is just one other sentence of this speech about which I wish to say a word, and that is the declaration that the peace must be a peace without victory. Now, I sympathize with that. But the peace that the President describes involves the absolute destruction and abandonment of the principles upon which this war was begun. It does not say "Servia", it does not say "Belgium", but there the chosen head of the American people has declared the principles of the American democracy in unmistakable terms; has declared for the independence and equal rights of all small and weak nations; has declared for a Monroe Doctrine of the whole world precluding all nations from interfering with the independent control of its own affairs by every small nation, from taking away the territory of other nations, from attempting to exercise the coercion of superior power over other nations, for disarmament, for the reduction of these mighty armies and navies. And every word of that declaration, which I

believe truly represents the conscience and judgment of the American people, denounces the sacrifice of Belgium and of Servia and the principles upon which they were made.

Now one side of that is the declaration that peace must be without victory. Suppose that such a peace cannot be made without victory, which is the superior? Which is to obtain? Of course, the great end and the choice of means becomes infinitely subordinate. If that peace, the peace that enthrones in the world principles of individual liberty and national right, and national subjection to the laws of morals can be obtained without any further military pressure, then, thank God for it. But if it cannot be obtained without such further military pressure as to end in victory, then let us pray for the victory.

It is one of the best qualities of human nature that makes us as we enjoy the blessings of freedom of intellect, freedom of religion, freedom of action, look back with gratitude to the men who sacrificed themselves in the long struggle of the ages for these things. Whether they be martyrs at the stake, or Cameronians in the Highlands of Scotland, or Huguenots in the Gvennes, or lawyers pleading for justice against popular clamor and disapproval, or brave men fighting in the defense of their country's liberty, we are all grateful to them because our blessings came from their noble sacrifice.

My friends, so sure am I that liberty and security in this land of ours depend upon the destruction and abandonment of the hated principle of national aggrandizement and immorality, and the enthronement of the principles of national responsibility and morality, that for all the countless generations to come after us in our dear land, I am grateful with all my heart to those men who are fighting in the trenches in France and Belgium and Russia and Italy and the Balkans today for the liberty and peace of my children's children.

AMERICA ON TRIAL

ADDRESS BEFORE THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB, NEW YORK
MARCH 20, 1917

I HAVE a deep conviction that we none of us, not one of us appreciates how serious the conditions are which confront us -- not one of us really understands how fraught with good or ill, with perpetuity for our institutions, or with the ruin of our country, is the course of the American people within the next few months.

It is difficult, in the midst of a great crisis, to feel how great it is, but no one need suppose that this mighty war which has shaken the world and which has involved all the continents but ours, will leave the world as it was on the first of August, 1914.

We are passing into a new world, with the new duties and new dangers, and we must confront our future, not with comfortable assurance that everything is to be as it has been, but with a clear and alert appreciation of what we are to meet.

The situation is a very extraordinary one. Germany is making war upon us. There may not be technically a war because it may be that it takes two to produce that; but Germany is making war upon us, and we are all waiting to see whether we are to take it "lying down." It is either war or it is submission to oppression.

Gradually a feeling is making its appearance, a restiveness of the people of the country. Tens of thousands of young men are seeking opportunity to prepare themselves for military service -- to drill, to get the A B C of the service in order that they may do their duty by the country when the

actual fighting comes. Commercial bodies, manufacturing bodies, professional bodies are meeting and discussing, all over the country, what they can do. There are multitudes of American citizens who are asking "What can I do for my country in this grave crisis?"

They can do nothing except through the executive departments at Washington. Nothing. No ship can sail; no regiment can march; no gun can be fired; no insult or injury can be repelled except through the executive departments at Washington.

What is there we can do? Only this: We can perform the duty of a free, self-governing people, by speaking in clear and certain tones, so that the spirit and the purpose and the will of a free people may be heard in Washington and our Government may know that the American people will be behind it, supporting it, approving it, sustaining it in maintaining the honor and the integrity and the independence and the freedom of our republic.

My diagnosis of the situation is that the President wants to hear from the people. He has said so many times. He wants to hear whether the people of the United States want him to go on and act. Let us answer to his want and tell him that the American people do want the Government not to discuss, and plan, and talk about what is going to be done, but to act. Let us say to him, and if we say it, others will say it also, that we wish all the powers he has now to be exercised; and let us say to Congress — and if we say it others will say it also — that we wish them to give to the Executive all the additional powers that may be found needed for the exercise of the entire force of this great nation for the support of its independence and its honor.

It is not merely a question as to whether ships shall be sunk, it is not merely a question as to whether our merchant

vessels shall navigate the seas or lie up in their ports; it is far broader and more far-reaching than that. Where are we to be when this war ends? What is going to happen to us then? Understand that no considerations of treaty faith or of international law, or of peaceful assurance, play any more a part in determining what one nation is to do to another. The solemn treaty for the protection of Belgium was turned into a scrap of paper, and the same principle which was applied to Belgium has now been applied to us. When our ships were sunk the supreme right of a powerful nation's interest was declared to be superior to all obligations of treaty and of law, and of peaceful assurance, and of humanity, and that is what we have to meet, and we must face it.

Consider this: the population of the world has doubled in the last eighty years; the pressure of population is surging over the boundaries of national territory; if the same rate of population growth continues during the next century, instead of seventeen hundred millions of inhabitants in the world there will be four thousand millions. The rapidly increasing population of Germany, thrusting out over her boundaries, sought colonies all over the world. Colonies were not enough, and the war that was forced upon Europe has been characterized and explained by the formal German manifesto in which peace was offered. The German Government said, "We were forced to take the sword for justice and the liberty of national evolution", which means evolution into the territory of others. The great east, the Orient, the hundreds of millions of the Orient, are multiplying with amazing rapidity, and they also seek liberty of national evolution. Africa has been partitioned, Asia has been partitioned, Europe is occupied, Australasia is occupied; what remains but America, that vast region, from Tierra del Fuego to the Caribbean, which has been protected heretofore by the

Monroe Doctrine ? What remains for the pressure of surplus population, and the liberty of national evolution, but that thinly-peopled and undefended territory ?

That is what we have got to face when this war is over. And where then is our Monroe Doctrine ? What is it worth without force behind it ? And if the Monroe Doctrine fails, if that is ignored, with a German naval station in the Caribbean and an Asiatic naval station in lower California, the Panama Canal is as worthless to us for strategic purposes as is the Dardanelles to Russia today. Then we will be face to face with the situation in which France has been for the last forty years, with strong, aggressive military powers on our borders.

The letter of Herr Zimmerman to Mexico, proposing the alliance of Mexico and Japan for the dismemberment of this union, was not a dream. It was an uncautious exhibition of a purpose -- a settled purpose which has been thought out and which is being worked out and which will continue to be worked out if possible until this country stands alone and defenseless against immediate and contiguous superior military power.

Now I am not talking about the will of this man or that; I am talking about the great movements of population. I am talking about those mighty forces which have in all history changed the face of the civilized world and set up and torn down nations. That mighty stream of mankind will follow the line of least resistance, and unless we are able to defend our rights, unless it is clearly understood that we will defend our rights, it will flow over us.

The serious thing for us today is that we are on trial. The question whether the American people are competent to defend their rights is being tried out now, and if we fail in the trial our rights will disappear. As Ambassador Gerard says

truly, if we had a million men under arms, we would not be so near the edge of war. If it is understood that this hundred million of people are animated by a common spirit, that they have the courage and the devotion which founded this free republic, no one will seek to prevail against us; but if it is understood that we are a weak, flabby, divided, and indifferent people, who can be insulted and assaulted and abused with impunity, then the tide flows over us and we are gone. Our country is gone. Our Union is gone. Our liberty is gone.

Make no mistake: Unless we demonstrate now that we have the courage and the power to defend ourselves against aggression, we will speedily reach the point where we cannot defend ourselves against aggression! We have been very unresponsive to a voice that should have called to us in the names of our fathers. We have stood dull and indifferent, while the peoples of Europe have been fighting against the negation of everything that makes America what it is. We have stood dull and unresponsive to England and France, and to Russia — now being revivified and glorified, thank God, while the spirit of democracy has been struggling to defend itself against the spirit of military despotism and the principles of absolute control by government over human life and human liberty.

We have forgotten the mission of America for liberty and justice. We have rejoiced in our prosperity. We have passed on the other side while men have suffered and died for the principles that our fathers taught us; and now it has been brought home to us with a last appeal. I remember that Horace Mann, just before the Civil War said, "The time has come to learn whether our Union is a rope of sand or a band of steel." The time has come now, in the inexorable course of fate, for the American people to learn whether there still lives in this republic the true spirit of a free democracy, or

whether we are merely a great aggregation of prosperous people, fit only to be a prey to the domination of an oppressor. Now, if our voice can be heard, if we can do something, anything, to make our Government feel that the free and loyal people of America want it to assert the principles of American liberty and freedom, and to assert them with the power of this great people, for God's sake, let us do it!

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD CRISIS

ADDRESS AS CHAIRMAN OF A PATRIOTIC MASS MEETING
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK
MARCH 22, 1917

IN all this vast assemblage, there are no parties and no partisans. We are all Americans. We come to exercise the right and perform the duty of citizens of a great self-governing republic, to voice, so far as in us lies, the people's mind upon the fateful issues of this present time.

We come not to find fault or to criticize. We come to turn our faces towards the Government of our choice, the Government, the President and the Congress, on whom weigh the terrible burdens of decision and action in the issue of peace or war, and in the service of that freedom which can be maintained, it now seems, only by war. In this government by the people, it must be the people themselves who act through the President and the Congress.

Autoerats with great standing armies can make war as they choose, because they have but to order and their regiments march; but in a democracy war cannot be made except as the people will that it shall be made. And we are here to bear the burden of freedom, in raising our voice as to what freedom demands in meeting the war that is now being waged against us. We do not underestimate the gravity of the situation in which our country finds itself. Our country has been ordered — ordered to leave the seas; ordered off the seas that are ours equally with all the other nations of the earth; ordered by the autocrat of Germany to leave those seas our fathers crossed in their frail barks in search of the freedom that they set up on this continent; ordered to leave those

seas that the commerce of America has whitened with its sails for more than a century; and our country has refused to obey the order.

We have been attacked with arms for refusing; our ships have been sunk; our people have been murdered; our men, our women, our children have been sent to their death by shot and shell and torpedo sped from German men-of-war because we refused to obey the order of Germany.

And what we are here to speak to our Government about is the question, — not a question with us, but the question whether we shall meet that attack by manly and brave defense, or by submission, — submission. It is no question now of peace; it is no question now of patience; it is a simple question whether or not we shall submit — crushed into submission — crushed into submission by the arms of the Germany which orders us off the seas. It is not a mere question of ships, it is not a mere question of leaving the seas, it is not a mere question of abandoning those rights of our independence; it is a far deeper and more serious question than that.

All history teaches us that the rich and defenseless peoples, the peoples who are too luxurious, too fond of their comfort, their prosperity, their wealth, their ease, to make sacrifice for their liberty, surely fall a prey to the aggressor. So Rome fell at the hands of barbarians, not more barbarous, not more cruel, not more arrogant and overbearing than the military class that rules Germany today. So Persia fell, with all her magnificence, before the arms of Alexander. So poor, peaceful China fell, three hundred years ago, before the invading Manchus; and but now, under the pressure of the great forces of freedom brought into the world, the poor Chinese are beginning to lay aside the shaven head and the pigtail that were the marks of their subjugation to the conquering race. So we will fall if our luxury, our wealth, our ease,

our unwillingness for sacrifice, make us unable to defend our independence and our liberty! All history shows that to defend a nation's rights you must begin at the beginning. One submission leads to new aggression, and one submission makes a second submission easier; and so, step by step, before a people knows, unwilling to realize the gravity and importance of each successive infringement of its rights, before it knows, its rights are gone, and it is a dependent and subject people.

We did think a few years ago that the reign of law had come into the world; we did think that the rules of law that all civilized nations had agreed to be bound by, were a protection to the peaceful, to the weak; we did think that the faith of treaties was a protection; but we have had a sad awakening. Neither the rules of law nor the faith of treaties nor the instincts of humanity, nor the teachings of civilization, nor the requirements of religion, stand in the way of those powers that are now seeking in the world, with fire and sword, what they call the liberty of national evolution, the liberty to send their increasing population out, and seize the territory and subjugate the inhabitants of other lands. No more the protection of treaty or of law guards the people of America round about. The doctrine that a state can do no wrong, the doctrine that a state is entitled to take with the strong arm what its interest requires, has been declared and is supported by one-half the military power of the world; and if the present war in Europe ends without a victory over the nations which are declaring and acting upon that hateful doctrine, there will be no peace nor safety for free democracies in this world, unless all free countries be turned into armed camps. Still more than that, whether Germany be conquered or not, if a peace be made in Europe; if a peace be made and America has no friends in the making of it to include —

[Here occurred an interruption by some of the audience, followed by expulsion.]

The first overt act by the agents of the delightful German plot to break up this meeting has made itself heard and is disposed of. There are some more of them here. But let me tell them that they must not push the patience of Americans too far.

I say once more about the war in Europe: if peace be made there and no friend of America includes in its terms anything to protect these western continents, the whole force of "national evolution" into the territory of others will be directed towards the vast territories, the immense wealth, of undefended America.

Africa is taken up, Asia is taken up; there is nothing left for the spoiler but the Americas, if they are not defended. Here we stand with our Monroe Doctrine that has so long protected us and the South and Central American nations. What will that be worth against the principles of national conduct that invaded Belgium, unless we are ready to defend it? If we yield our rights in weak submission now, will we be ready to act when Germany establishes a naval base in the Caribbean, and some other military country establishes a base in southern California, both commanding the Panama Canal, and making that Canal absolutely worthless for our own protection?

If we yield in weak submission now, the Monroe Doctrine is not worth the paper it is printed on, from this time forward. And so the question is not about ships, not about saving the seas, but it is whether America has the spirit and the power to defend her rights, to defend her independence, her liberty, her peace, her safety, her wealth, her homes.

The question is not merely whether we shall submit, but whether the world shall be made to understand that America, with its hundred million of people, with its vast wealth, with

its great traditions, with all the independent spirit of the greatest free democracy, has the power and the courage to defend herself!

I hate war, but I welcome the coming of the inevitable at the beginning. I do not want to defend my house by putting off an attack during the brief minutes that I can spend under the bed! I say that upon the issue of the war in Europe hangs the question whether America shall, at the close of that war, be turned into one armed camp, or whether America shall be a subject nation. There is no nation on earth — not England, nor France, nor Belgium, nor Italy, nor Russia, with a greater stake in the success of the Allies in this war against German militarism, than the United States. We are able to hold this peaceful meeting — with a few weak explosions — and why? Because we are protected by the navies and armies of the Allies!

A VOICE: That's a lie!

[Followed by the ejection of the interruptor.]

If we were not protected by those armies and navies across the Atlantic, German ships would be outside of our harbor, for Germany never hesitates to strike. The self-respect, the dignity and the honor of our country require that we shall not longer hide under the protection of others, but shall proceed to protect ourselves!

One thing more. Every American, every true American heart should respond with joy, amid its sorrow, to the feeling that if we enter this war to do our part towards bringing about the victory that is so important to us, we shall be fighting over again the battle of the American democracy, along with the democracy of England, the democracy of France, the democracy of Italy, and now, God be praised, the great democracy of Russia; fighting for the principle of free self-government against the principle of old-time autocracy and military power; and every American should be at heart,

and with his voice and his effort, his sacrifice and his prayers, aiding in that great battle of the ages.

Our fathers lit the torch: it was our fight for the freedom of self-governing democracies that unloosed the bonds upon the people of England; it was our success that gave courage and hope to the men of France, who cast down the Bourbons and set up the republic. No man has fought for liberty during this century and a half, in all this world, who has not been cheered and strengthened by the example and the spirit of our free America; and if that spirit is not dead, as I know it is not, that spirit is with the Allies who are fighting our battles!

THE DUTY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN THE WAR

SPEECH BEFORE THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN CLUB
APRIL 9, 1917

The preceding pages contain several recent addresses by Mr. Root dealing with the momentous problems confronting the United States and growing out of the European war. Following the President's message to Congress on April 2, 1917, and the declaration of a state of war against the Imperial German Government on April 6, a meeting was held in the Republican Club of New York on April 9, 1917, at which the principal address was made by Mr. Root. It is an appeal to friends and associates to forget politics, to stand loyally behind the Administration, and to unite their forces to the end that the war into which the United States has entered in behalf of democracy, humanity, and international justice, may be waged by a united country, with all its resources, to a successful conclusion. Unfortunately, Mr. Root had prepared no notes of his address and there was no regular reporter present; the editors are compelled to rely upon the incomplete newspaper accounts of what was undoubtedly one of the most effective of Mr. Root's public addresses.

THE war upon which our country has now entered is not over the question of ships or whether Americans shall insist upon their right to travel the high seas. These are but illustrative and symbolical of the great issues. The struggle is between liberty and justice on one side and oppression and barbarism on the other. It has been growing more and more manifest during the past two and a half years that the conflict raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, between the Central European Powers and the Allies, is a conflict for the control of the world. From all the confusing statements and mass of documents at the beginning of the war there has gradually emerged the ascertained certainty that Germany, under the leadership of the military caste of Prussia, has entered upon a great undertaking for which she has been preparing for more than a generation with but one object, the hegemony of the world. The Allies with whom we have now ranged ourselves

are fighting to prevent being reduced to subjection by the military power of Germany.

Our declaration of war now has saved the American people from irretrievable disaster immediately after the conclusion of the war in Europe. It has become startlingly evident that if Germany wins this war, the same principles under which she treated the covenant with Belgium as a scrap of paper, and laid waste and sacked and burned the towns, and murdered the people of that poor and peaceful country, and under which she has violated every rule of international law and the obligations of treaties, will be applied by her to the rest of the world. The issue of the war is the issue of submission to the same principle of conduct which took the lives of women and children in Belgium.

Even though Germany may not be successful in this war, she will still remain the Germany of seventy millions of people. They will still be there. If, after the war, Germany is left with her power intact, if the terms of peace provide no terms for the western continent, then Germany will be free to seize her only opportunity to recoup the damages of the war. There will be but one avenue in which she can continue her career of expansion, and that will be through the broad, rich fields of the western continent. What then will become of the Monroe Doctrine? If we shrink from the test now, what will we do if Germany establishes a base in the Caribbean at the very entrance to the Panama Canal? If we do nothing now, we will do nothing then. If we do not get ready now, we will not be ready then. If we are not stirred to action now, we will not be stirred to action then. If such a base be established on our border as a basis for new aggression, how long will it be before we find ourselves in the condition of a subject people, unready to defend our liberties? Ordinary intelligence should make the country provide now against that certain result in the future.

The war, however, is more than a conflict between nations. It is a conflict between two hostile principles; the principle of democracy which rests upon individual freedom, and the principle of autocracy which rests upon military force. The two are as far apart as freedom and slavery. President Lincoln said the country could not endure half free and half slave. It is also true that the world cannot endure half free and half Prussian. Democracies cannot live in the same world with aggressive military autocracies. To remain alongside such a military power means that the democracy must submit to the will of the autocracy, or the democracy must make itself always ready for defense against attack; but the conditions of modern war make it impossible for democracy to keep itself always prepared for defense against attack, and to continue its free democratic institutions; for the successful conduct of war involves extensive and essential surrenders of individual liberty. If military autocracies are to continue, the world must either submit or must become a group of armed camps, inhabited by people who have surrendered their liberties to military authority. The President was right when he said that the world must be made safe for democracy. In order that it shall be safe, the domination of the Prussian caste must be prevented. We are to fight for that; we are to fight for our own liberties and the liberties of all mankind. We are to fight for the ideals of America, for the mission of America, for the enfranchisement of the world.

With this solemn and stupendous duty resting upon the American people, with the acceptance of this burden we must be ready to take our part. What is our part; what are our duties? We are Republicans. We have special duties as Republicans. Our party was defeated at the last election, and the opposing party is in possession of the Government. Our first duty is to control ourselves; to banish from our hearts every feeling of partisanship, of party prejudice, and

fill them with patriotism and love of country, and the sole desire to do our duty to our country. Criticism and fault-finding and discontent have been incidents of all our wars. They are incident to our free and easy democracy. They will come again inevitably. As we love our country, we must now give to the Democratic administration our whole-hearted, earnest, sincere support. That is the only way we can prove not merely our love for our country as individuals, but demonstrate that the Republican Party loves its country more than it cares for place and power. When the inevitable shortcomings of democracy come — as come they must — then is the time for stout hearts to stand by their country, to say that no matter what mistakes are made we will support the Government of our country.

We must sweep all partisanship away. The men in Washington are *our* President, *our* Cabinet, and *our* Congress, no matter whose votes elected them. We will stand by the President now, as we stood by Lincoln when the faint-hearted and the scurrilous were crying that the war was a failure. We will demonstrate the real patriotism of the Republican Party in good repute and ill repute, in success, in failure, come what may, for the fate of our country is involved. Other countries change governments. England has now a coalition government. France has changed her government several times since the war began. And now, the great Russian democracy has come into its own and overthrown the autocratic government which was already bargaining with Germany for the preservation of autocracy. Our government cannot be changed between elections. For four years democrats must control in Washington, and we must give them as whole-hearted, earnest, sincere support as if every man there were a Republican. We need no coalition government to make us loyal. We will make a coalition our-

selves with every Democrat in the country. The coalition of the United States will be of all its people to hold up the hands of the Government of the United States, no matter which party holds the reins.

Only one thing we will say to the party in power, — let us have a real war. Let us lose no opportunity in public or in private to urge and insist upon a vigorous and real war. There must be no dillydallying or half measures nor any giving in to peace terms until democracy is triumphant. Let us so conduct this war that no nation will ever again think that it is a light or an easy thing to enter upon war with the United States.

Speeding the completion of the naval program and the upbuilding of a great army are the principal tasks immediately ahead of the United States. Here there must be no jealousies between states, no quibbling over whether governors shall retain the appointing power. It is our duty to make a national army, an army single in purpose and sympathy, responsible to one Commander-in-Chief of the American Army, and without any of the bickerings that have wrecked so many fair causes. There should be a system of universal military service. In that vigorous war which we advocate, one thing ought to be done at the earliest practicable day. An American army, great if possible, small if must be, should be put on the battle-line of France and Belgium, so that all the world will know that American democracy is really fighting for the principles of American freedom, side by side with England, France, Russia, and the other allied countries, in the world war for the freedom of the human race; and no one may doubt that we are with our friends, heart and soul, ready to offer our sacrifice in the great cause in which we have so much to gain and so much to lose. The honor and dignity of our country depend upon the

part it now plays. We have got to show that the United States is a nation and not a mere aggregation of people. The United States must fight with all its resources of men and money, with all its inventive and business genius, with all its heart and soul.

The war cannot be ended with anything else than the complete overthrow of autocracy.

GERMANY, RUSSIA, AND THE UNITED STATES

ADDRESS BEFORE THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB, NEW YORK
AUGUST 15, 1917

Following Mayor Mitchel's reception to the Russian Mission at the New York City Hall on August 15, 1917, and the luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of New York on the same day, the Mission was tendered a reception by the Union League Club in the evening. The members of the Mission were presented to the members of the club by the president, the Honorable Charles E. Hughes, who then introduced the head of the Mission in the following words:

This is an occasion of unique interest. Our fellow-member, whom we have long honored and loved, returns to us from a service of vast importance, most admirably and nobly performed. He has received the official welcome of the city; he has been greeted by the most important commercial body of this metropolis; but we desire to add to these greetings, in which we are glad to have had a share, the more intimate welcome that comes from his old-time friends in this Union League Club.

When it was announced that the President had selected Mr. Root to go as the head of this important mission to Russia, we were all extremely glad that the best thought of the nation was to find expression through this eminent statesman. I am sure, however, that the friends of Mr. Root had some little misgiving, because at that time we were filled with uncertainty and apprehension. The age which his appearance belies was about to be put to a severe test. He might well have sought exemption from such an arduous task; but whatever was in the minds of his friends was not in his mind. To him there was but one thought, and that was, that any service within his power to render to the nation he would render, here or anywhere. That, gentlemen, according to place and opportunity and talent, is the very essence of patriotism, and the nation has no abler statesman and no finer patriot than Elihu Root.

Now he has returned. Our misgivings, as is usual with most of our misgivings, were without warrant. He has performed the most difficult task that could be set to him to perform, that of adding luster to a name already so renowned. He returns to us from this service, the importance of which we all appreciate, with a message. We are glad to greet him as a friend, but we are even more keen to hear what he has to say with respect to conditions on the other side. The greatest event of this period of extraordinary events is the emergence of the people of Russia into the responsibilities and privileges and enormous difficulties of freedom. God forbid that any one in the United States

should look askance at Russia. Russia, our great sister nation, carries now in no small degree the hopes of humanity, and every one whose heart is full of the intense desire that man shall move forward to happier and better days, that freedom shall be world-wide and that there shall be in the future such an organization in the world as will prevent the recurrence of war, looks today to Russia, full of sympathy, full of pride in what has already been accomplished under the most extreme difficulties, full of intense personal interest, with that feeling of brotherhood which must possess us if we are not only to fight for democracy, but to be worthy of democracy when won.

Now we are here to listen to a message from one who has been most successful in interpreting the thought of America to the people of Russia in this crisis. He and those who were associated with him in this mission have, it seems to me, been very successful in conveying our thought to them, and it is important that they should now from this vantage-ground of personal observation, interpret Russia as they have seen Russia, as they have learned to know Russia, to us. We are living in a world where the future depends on our mutual understanding — not on formal programs, not on the formal engagements of nations, but upon an understanding of aims which we hold in common for human betterment.

It is a peculiar privilege to listen to our distinguished fellow-member on his return from this great errand on behalf of the United States. It is my great pleasure to introduce Mr. Elihu Root.

I WISH to explain to my associates of the Special Diplomatic Mission that some of the nice things which our president has said tonight are a matter of habit. He says them to me because this is my home. The gray-headed old men you see about you and I have lived together in this club, have cultivated and stimulated each other's patriotism here in the atmosphere created by the founders of the club, for the last forty years, and the younger members have come into the fellowship of the club and have inherited the tradition; and they say these nice things because I am theirs and they are mine, and we love each other, and we have confidence each in the other's love of country, and sincerity of purpose, and willingness to sacrifice and to labor for the common good of our beloved country.

I am to say something about Russia, and I wish also to say something about America. I thought often while in Russia, as I watched the labors and judged the mental state and feelings of the men who were engaged in the hard task of

building up the government in Russia, of those men of the days of '63 who gathered in the old club house in Union Square to render the same service to the American democracy then struggling against the impending danger of death to the Republic.

I wish to say to you that I never have seen a more gallant fight with purer motives and nobler purpose than the few men who are controlling the government of Russia today have been making against overwhelming odds for the freedom of their people and the safety of democracy in Russia and in the world.

Everything was against them; the soldiers and the people, the peasants who make up eighty-five per cent of Russia, had lost a leader. They had not been in the habit of thinking upon political questions, they had been in the habit of obeying, and the word which they had obeyed was gone. The soldiers had lost the command to follow, they had lost their national head, they had lost their national flag. The laws which received their sanction from the Czar, when the Czar was gone, no longer seemed to have moral obligation. The police had disappeared. The people of Russia were practically without government, for the Provisional Government had no power to execute a decree. Without police, without law, their own orderly habits, their own mutual consideration for the rights of others alone remained to preserve their respect for property and life and human rights. Throughout Russia, with no other safeguard, order reigned as perfect as reigns in the United States today, because the people of Russia have ingrained, inherent characteristics, qualities of character which are necessary for the maintenance of free self-government.

Germany, making common cause with those extremists who would break down and destroy all industrial organization, all national authority, Germany carried on in the

early months of the revolution a great propaganda in a score of ways to pervert the minds of the Russian people. Her agents swarmed over the border, they spent money by the million in buying adherents to the German cause; they purchased newspapers and established newspapers; they distributed literature; their troops, under order, swarmed out of the trenches with open arms to fraternize with the Russian troops. They said to them, "Why do you fight us? This was the Czar's war, it was not your war. Why do you want to kill us who are your friends? Why do you want to get killed? Why not go home and share in the division of the land? If you do not hurry you will get left, it will all be in other hands. Why go on with the Czar's war, which was not your war?" And they produced an effect on the army of Russia that made them generally, along all the thousand-mile line, unwilling to fight. The Russians were tired of the war, as all the peoples of Europe are tired of the war. And when we reached Russia it seemed as if the game was over. Sagacious observers there said, "According to all the rules of the game, Russia is out of the war."

A few men, thoughtful men, realized that the erection of a system of free self-government according to the life, the customs, the spirit of Russian life, could never be developed under the suzerainty of Germany. They realized that subjection to Germany meant the death of Russian liberty; and they set out to re-inspire in the Russian people a knowledge, a realization, a spirit of defense for their newly-won freedom; and under the splendid leadership of Kerensky, under the wise and sagacious control of Nekrasoff and Terestchenko and Tseratelli and a score of others, they gradually brought discipline back. Out of confusion and bewilderment they have brought a knowledge and a realization of duty, and Russia has found herself, and has begun again to fight for the preservation of her own freedom.

Germany has appealed in Russia, as she has appealed in America and all over the world, to all the baser motives of mankind. She has appealed to cupidity, she has bought men in and out of office, right and left, by scores. She has expended millions of money in Russia, as she has here, to buy treason for her own benefit. She has appealed to passion and prejudice, to local interest that quarrels with the public good, to personal selfishness and ambitions. Wherever in Russia, wherever in this world a baser motive was to be found, Germany has developed a feeling for it as swift and irresistible as any chemical combinations that we know of. Every base, every despicable, every damnable influence that tends to break down law and order and to frustrate noble purposes and great designs for good, she has employed. She has done it in Russia, as she has done it here, with diabolical ingenuity. But in one thing Germany has failed; she has been incapable of measuring, of understanding, the great moral forces that move mankind, the great moral force leading modern civilization to higher and better things.

Germany could not understand that love of country and the passionate desire for Italia Irredenta would take Italy out of the Triple Alliance and range her against the German armies.

She could not understand that England, which, set in the enjoyment of peace and wealth, had turned a deaf ear to the warning of good old Lord Roberts, that England would revolt at the shameful bargain that was proposed to Sir Edward Grey, to connive, to wink at the violations of treaties that protected Belgium and stand idly by while poor Belgium was overrun with indescribable cruelty and savagery. She could not understand that down from Puritan ancestry and the nobility of the Cavaliers of many generations, there came a spirit of moral power in England that would array her against the damnable wrong that Germany did to Belgium.

Germany could not understand that the British colonies had replaced the rule of force that once bound them to England by a bond of sentiment a thousand times stronger than all the red-coats that ever garrisoned the citadel of Quebec.

Germany could not understand that the longings for freedom and self-government of South Africa could transmute the fairness and justice of the final settlement of the relation between England and the Boers into a feeling of loyalty to England upon the part of the Boers.

Germany could not understand that there was a line beyond which the free, rich, comfortable people of the United States of America, rejoicing in their prosperity and their comfort, would not pass — a line at which the ideals of their fathers and an ingrained sense of devotion to the liberty of mankind forbade the sordid considerations of prosperity and wealth longer to govern the free American people.

Then, again, buying treason in Russia, playing upon sordid motives and every degraded impulse to be found in Russia, Germany again has failed to understand the moral power of that great empire, and that great justice and liberty-loving people. Time was but a few months ago when a regiment of Germans could have marched over the border and gone where they would; but they misjudged the moral force of the Russian people, and they waited too long. They waited until the power of regeneration, so strong in the Russian character, had had time to begin its work, and they are moving too late. I do not know what the fortunes of the battlefield may be, but I do think that the Russian people have again found themselves, and again begun one of those extraordinary recoveries which the indomitable spirit of Russia makes possible beyond the experience of any other race.

Now we have sent a mission of congratulation and friendship and coöperation to Russia, and we are committed to help Russia. There are many things in which she can be helped; in money, for her financial condition is bad; in munitions, for her soldiers must have munitions with which to fight; in transportation, in locomotives and cars, for her rolling stock is almost worn out in these three years of war; in a dozen material ways, as well as in the courage and hope that come from comradeship and faith and confidence that we all need. I hope that all of you will stand by our Government in rendering the fullest measure of help to Russia, which is fighting our battles with her own; poor Russia, desperately weary of the war, still gathering herself for another campaign, while we are entering the war fresh and unharmed. I hope you will all stand by the Government of our country in rendering the full measure of help to Russia, and I hope that you will aid the people of the United States to support the Government in rendering that help by a universal sentiment of desire for comradeship and support on the part of the people of the United States. Material, substantial, practical aid is needed that Russia shall go on with the war. That we must give if we are true to our assurances, and if we are true to our principles.

I want to say a word — not too many words — about the situation in America. I feel that there are still some Americans who do not quite understand why we are fighting, why we are about to fight. If they did, they would stop these pro-German traitors who are selling out our country, who are endeavoring to make us unsuccessful in the war that we have undertaken, who are endeavoring to make our actions inefficient, who are endeavoring by opposition and obstruction, in Congress and out of Congress, to make what America does in preparation for the war so ineffective, partial, and incom-

petent, that when our young men go to the firing line in France and Flanders they will meet defeat. If our people all understood why it is that we are going into this war, they would rise up and crush these traitors down to earth. There are men walking about the streets of this city tonight that ought to be taken out at sunrise tomorrow and shot for treason. They are doing their work under false pretense; they are professing to be for the country and they are lying every day and in every word. They are covering themselves with the cloak of pretended Americanism; and if we are competent and fit for our liberty, we will find them out and get at them. And every one of us can help, not by talking to each other about what we hear, but by carrying to the authorities charged with the pursuit and detection of traitors, all the information we can gather.

And understand, and I hope they will understand, it is only a question of time. We are only a democracy, we have not the swift decision and competent action of a military autocracy, but we cannot be fooled or played with too long. There are some newspapers published in this city every day, the editors of which deserve conviction and execution for treason. And sooner or later they will get it. The American people are not going to see their young men led to death through the machinations of these ill-concealed friends of the enemy of our country.

Now, why is it that we are going into this fight? Specifically, the sinking of our ships and the murder of our citizens by the U-boats, in violation of the well-established and agreed-upon rules of the law of nations. That does not tell the whole story, because that action in violation of the law of nations, in violation of the rules of humanity and in violation of the well-established principles of our civilization, is but an illustration of what it is that Germany proposes to the world. It is but an illustration of what we are all to expect if Ger-

many acquires domination over the world, as Rome dominated the world; and it is to prevent that domination which will be the death of liberty, the downfall of democracy, the restoration of tyranny, that America is entering this war; and it is to preserve not merely the freedom, the democracy of the world at large, but the freedom and the democracy of our own country, that we are entering the war.

It is an old saying that to govern is to foresee, and the democracy that governs must be able to foresee. You cannot expect all the people who are working upon the farms and in the factories and in the stores and shops to be so familiar with international affairs as to look forward and forecast the future, but you can expect that in a competent, self-governing democracy there shall be many men who are sufficiently familiar with the affairs of the world to form a just forecast of what their country is to expect in the near future, judging from what they see in the present; and that forecast leaves no doubt whatever that if Germany were to win in this war the liberty of America would be worth not a song. If Germany were to win in this war, it would mean the dismemberment of this Union and the subjection of this people!

Do you remember what Bismarck said about the Monroe Doctrine? He said it was a piece of colossal impudence. Do you remember what William, the present William, the great war lord, said at the time of the Venezuelan affair? He said if he had had a larger navy he would have taken the United States by the scruff of the neck. Do you remember what Admiral Dietrich undertook to do in Manila Bay, when Dewey sent word to him, "If you want to have a fight, you can have it now"? Did you observe what Germany was doing in Haiti just before this war was opened? She was seeking a foothold in Haiti — for a naval base in the Caribbean, commanding the Panama Canal, and robbing us for-

ever of our security, and making it necessary that we should keep forever great navies and great armies for our protection against sudden and unexpected attack.

What has Germany been doing all over the world but meddling with the affairs of every country, to extend her own dominion ? Africa, Asia, the islands of the South Seas, she has seized upon. About all the world is taken up except the vast and ill-populated and undefended stretches of incalculable wealth in the New World — South America and North America.

Now, add to the gloss that we have in specific facts upon the character and purpose of Germany, the avowed principles of Germany: no faith or treaties are binding on her; no law is to bind her when it is against the interests of Germany. National interest is above all obligations of law and faith. That is her supreme law.

To seize what she desires is right in her eyes. To lie when it will benefit his country, is honorable to a German gentleman. Not one of the principles that have illustrated the civilization of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is held in the slightest regard by the military autocracy that rules Germany. They have harked back to those dark and dreadful days of the past when might was the only right, and all man need do was to seize what his strong right hand could hold; to those days when there was no liberty or justice for plain, common people; to those days when the principles of Rome governed the actions of men. Then turn your eyes to America, with Germany holding those principles, moved by such impulses, repudiating all laws and treaties upon which we rely for protection, with a lust for territory and a pride in conquest, and an overwhelming belief in the right of their race to dominate the world; and think what America would have had to meet if this war had closed with the success of Germany, with the fertile fields and the rich mines of South

and North America lying undefended. As clear as the daylight on this morning is the lesson; as certain as the sunrise tomorrow was the inevitable fate of the United States if Germany were to win this war. We have entered the war to fight for liberty, for democracy, not in the abstract, but in order that our children may inherit a free land, and be subject to no master, be subservient to no arrogant military caste. That is why we are fighting, and that calls for every ounce of weight we have in America; it calls for the sternness and severity of men who understand that we are fighting for life; it calls for a treatment of these recreant scoundrels who are trying to help the enemy of our liberty, treatment as severe and rigid as our strength makes it possible to extend.

We are going to fight, that our old men and children shall not be murdered, and our women outraged, that our opportunities in life shall not be cut off, and that our people who have lived with no political superior for more than a hundred years may not be reduced to a condition of vassals. And it is no easy thing; we have got to suffer and to endure. It is no business in which we should be concerned about trifles. We may not like this or that or the other thing that a public officer does. The main thing, the great thing is to do nothing that will retard or divert or hinder the exercise of the full power of the American people in this mighty conflict, and to do everything that we can to add to that power, and press forward to the accomplishment of the great and necessary object of winning the war.

Now, thoughtful Russians feel that. The war is at their doors. Their young men have died, and mourning is throughout the land, and they are wearied of the war; but they feel that their liberty will be lost if they do not gather again for the conflict; and we soon or late must come to feel it, and the sooner we feel it, the sooner it will be over and the victory won.

A FEDERATED UNION OF THE AMERICAN BAR

ADDRESS AT THE SPECIAL CONFERENCE OF DELEGATES FROM
THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND DELEGATES
FROM STATE AND LOCAL BAR ASSOCIATIONS
SARATOGA SPRINGS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1917

A special conference was held in connection with the annual meeting of the American Bar Association at Saratoga Springs, the second of its kind, the first having been held at Chicago, following an invitation extended by the American Bar Association, over the signature of its then president, Elihu Root. Mr. Julius Henry Cohen of New York named Mr. Root as presiding officer of the Saratoga conference, saying: "It is the great privilege of the Committee on Arrangements to present for your consideration as chairman of this conference the name of Elihu Root." Mr. Root was declared the unanimous choice of the conference as its presiding officer, and spoke as follows:

I THANK you for your cordiality in selecting me to act as chairman of this meeting.

The subject is one in which I have taken a great interest, because after acting as president, first of the local bar association of my own city, then as president of the bar association of my own state, and then as president of the American Bar Association, I have come to feel that there is a great loss of power, a great waste of opportunity, through the failure of these different associations to function with proper reference to each other. It seemed to me that the local associations lacked something of the strength and effectiveness that would come from a consciousness of a broader scope of activity in the profession than is possible to a local association shut up in itself, and that the national association was wholly unable to accomplish results in many most important directions because it lacked the personal touch with the bars of the different localities. It seemed to me that the difficulties that existed were not to be met by any scheme of

combination, of reorganization — of a federal system, of an absorbing one of the other — that any such plan, and there were many of them, would result in the destruction of either the local associations or the national association; but that there could be a very great increase of power by establishing association and by coöperation, by establishing close and systematic relations between local and state associations and the national association, leaving each class of association free and sovereign in its own domain.

That view — I speak of my understanding of it, not because I originated it, for it was the view which was entertained by many gentlemen of the bar and was expressed in conversation here and there in a desultory way — led to the call for a conference last year, which, after a quite full discussion, realized that it was only on the threshold of the subject, and so called for this further conference. What we were talking about last year was the betterment of our methods, our institutions; the improvement of conditions at the bar; the improvement of the morale, the prosperity and the effectiveness of the bar and the improvement of the administration of justice. Some things were called for that the national association could do; some things were called for that the state and local associations could do, for the improvement of ordinary conditions — setting up a movement for progress towards better conditions all the time. We all realized that the bar had rather lagged behind in availing itself of the power of organization and association which almost all kinds of business had adopted, and in almost all the other relations of life, multiplying the power of man.

Today there has been a change in conditions which presents an infinitely more important and pressing necessity for the highest effectiveness of the bar, not merely for the betterment of its conditions, not merely for the improvement of the administration of justice in the ordinary course of affairs,

but for the preservation of the institutions upon which our law rests; for the preservation of the system of justice that we represent, and in behalf of which we speak from day to day, from the time we receive our first diploma until the time that we lay down all our human activities.

There was much discussion about little things at the beginning of this great war; questions of dates and of negotiations between foreign offices, whether this one was really in favor of this or not, and whether that one ought to have done something or ought not to have done something which would have a bearing upon the preservation of peace and the prevention of war. Gradually, as time has gone on and facts have developed more clearly, it has become perfectly plain that this war is not solely a conflict between specific ambitions, but that it is a conflict between two opposed and inevitably opposed systems of government, of policy, of polities, of human society. It has become quite evident that this war was brought on with a purpose to establish throughout the civilized world a military autocracy. It has become perfectly evident that more than a generation of careful, purposeful, and intense preparation had been made for this very thing and that the democracies of the world — loosely compact, rejoicing in peace and in prosperity, in political freedom, in individual liberty — were unprepared, were in great measure and in differing degrees unprepared, to meet the attack upon them. Slowly it became apparent to the democracies of the world that the principle upon which they live must be defended against the attack of the adverse principle, the domination of which means the spread of autocracy and the everlasting destruction of the system of individual liberty of which we are the high priests of the bar. So long as there exists a great and powerful military autocracy, which has as its purpose to secure domination by military force, so long republics, democracies, countries

which preserve individual freedom and individual rights — countries which subordinate government to freedom — must be at the mercy of that autocracy; they must do its will and submit to its control, or they must enter upon a systematic preparation of military force for defense, to an extent which in itself must destroy democracy, must destroy individual liberty. Let me make that plain by an illustration. We are today in war; we have entered upon the present great war in order that we may before it is too late defend our future liberty and security against the domination of an overpowering and arrogant military autocracy; that we may defend our liberty and our future security, while there is yet a chance of defending it, because there are still other powers with which we can join to defend it.

What is the effect of our entering upon the war? The effect is that we have surrendered, and are obliged to surrender, a great measure of that liberty which you and I have been asserting in court during all of our lives. Power over property, power over person, has to be vested in a military commander in order to carry on war successfully. You cannot have free democracy and successful war at the same moment. The inevitable conclusion is that if you have to live with a great powerful military autocracy as your neighbor you cannot maintain your democracy. And another inference is that if you are to maintain your democracy you must kill autocracy.

As well go to sleep with a burglar sitting in your front hall as to talk about the peace and the security of a democracy with Germany still competent to pursue its career of domination! Think of it for a moment. If we had not gone into this war and Germany had succeeded and had come out with her power unbroken and had applied to us, as she had very well the will to do, the same principles that she applied to Serbia and to Belgium, and we had undertaken to prepare to

defend our rights as we are now preparing to defend them, and the armies and the navies of the Allies in Europe had not held down the German fleets and the German army, what would Germany have been doing to us now? What would have happened to us during these five months of confusion and doubt and the learning of military organization in the infant class? What would Germany have done to us during the past five months if she had not been held down in Europe? Why, her heel would have been upon our neck. So our entrance into this war has been a grasping at the one chance for the preservation of our system of government, our independent bar, our independent courts, our rights of American manhood to assert the rights of the individual in all places and against all power. Our entrance into this war has been a grasping at the one chance there was to continue the free republic that our fathers have handed down to us, and to preserve everything that makes the life of a lawyer dignified and worth the living.

And our vigorous and successful prosecution of this war is the sole way in which we can make that chance a successful one. There is no room now for argument as to whether we should or whether we should not; we are in the war, and the stake for which we fight is liberty in independence and the justice of our American country, our American life, our American ideals. It is we of the bar who stand at the door through which oppression will enter. It is not so easy for the farmer to see that there will be a difference in his crops or in the sale of them; for the manufacturer to see that any one will stop wearing clothing or shoes or using machinery, but it is easy for us to see that with the domination of that military system which subordinates law, which makes the bar only a part of the administrative system of government and leaves the bench no independence — it is easy for the lawyer to see that everything he has contended for of indi-

vidual liberty and the supremacy of law over executive power will be attacked and destroyed if we do not succeed in this war. Now, it is necessary that the bar of the United States shall be alive to this fact, that it may constitute a great informing and enlightening power throughout our land so that the humblest workingman in the field or in the factory may be awakened to the necessity for the preservation of our liberty, and our system of law and justice. The bar should exert every influence and every power that it possibly can over its clients, over its friends and associates throughout every community where its members live, giving the cry of alarm, and urging the support of the whole community for the men who represent the law and the enforcement of it, for liberty and for property.

This change to warlike conditions does not supersede what we were talking about a year ago. It only illustrates the importance of it; it adds a thousand fold to the importance of it; it calls for an increase of power through association and organization that we were seeking for last year and makes it a hundred times as pressing in its demand, a hundred times as important in its result.

And so let us go on with our effort to weld the bars of all the states and of all the towns, not into the American Bar Association, not into any state association, but into a federal union, not on paper, but by growth and association and coöperated action — a federated union of all the bars in all the states and all the towns; a federated union of all the bars which, in time, will produce by the natural processes of growth the American bar, the greatest power for liberty and justice, for right and manhood, that this world has ever produced.

THE AMERICAN BAR AND THE WAR

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SEPTEMBER 4, 1917

At the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, held at Saratoga Springs, New York, September 4-7, 1917, the first business transacted was the unanimous adoption by a rising vote of the following resolutions, presented by Mr. Root in behalf of the Executive Committee. In presenting the resolutions, Mr. Root said:

I ASK leave to submit to the Association a special and preliminary report from the Executive Committee. Your committee feel that the essential character of the great conflict upon which our country is now entering challenges the special attention and judgment of the bar above all other classes or groups of the community. It is plain to the thoughtful observer that at the bottom the world conflict is between two opposing principles of organization of civil society. It is between the principle of government by divine right with the subordination of individual liberty to the forces that maintain autocracy, and the principle of individual liberty, with the organization of government for the preservation of that liberty upon the basis of popular authority. The conflict is the result of forces mightier than the will of any nation which in the providence of God have brought this people to the point where once again they are required to fight, at the sacrifice of comfort and ease and property and life, for the institutions that they cherish, for the liberty they are determined to maintain, and for the justice which they hope to hand down to their children. And your committee feel that at the outset of these proceedings the representatives of the American bar should speak regarding their attitude toward this conflict with no uncertain sound — should speak as men who have all their lives

been standing for justice and maintaining law and liberty. The committee have, therefore, instructed me to present the following resolutions and recommend their adoption by this Association:

The American Bar Association declares its absolute and unqualified loyalty to the Government of the United States.

We are convinced that the future freedom and security of our country depend upon the defeat of German military power in the present war.

We urge the most vigorous possible prosecution of the war with all the strength of men and materials and money which the country can supply.

We stand for the speedy dispatch of the American army, however raised, to the battle-front in Europe, where the armed enemies of our country can be found and fought and where our own territory can be best defended.

We condemn all attempts in Congress and out of it to hinder and embarrass the Government of the United States in carrying on the war with vigor and effectiveness.

Under whatever cover of pacifism or technicality such attempts are made, we deem them to be in spirit pro-German and in effect giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

We declare the foregoing to be overwhelmingly the sentiment of the American bar.

THE WAR AND DISCUSSION

ADDRESS AT A WAR MASS MEETING IN THE COLISEUM
CHICAGO, SEPTEMBER 14, 1917

THE declaration of war between the United States and Germany completely changed the relations of all the inhabitants of this country to the subject of peace and war.

Before the declaration everybody had a right to discuss in private and in public the question whether the United States should carry on war against Germany. Everybody had a right to argue that there was no sufficient cause for war, that the consequences of war would be worse than the consequences of continued peace, that it would be wiser to submit to the aggressions of Germany against American rights, that it would be better to have Germany succeed than to have the Allies succeed in the great conflict. Everybody holding these views had a right by expressing them to seek to influence public opinion and to affect the action of the President and the Congress, to whom the people of the country by their Constitution have entrusted the power to determine whether the United States shall or shall not make war. But the question of peace or war has now been decided by the President and Congress, the sole authorities which had the right to decide, the lawful authorities who rested under the duty to decide. The question no longer remains open. It has been determined, and the United States is at war with Germany.

The power to make such a decision is the most essential, vital, and momentous of all the powers of government. No nation can maintain its independence or protect its citizens against oppression or continue to be free, which does not vest the power to make that decision in some designated authority, or which does not recognize the special and imperative

duties of citizenship in time of war following upon such a decision lawfully made. One of the cardinal objects of the union which formed this nation was to create a lawful authority whose decision and action upon this momentous question should bind all the states and all the people of every state.

The Constitution under which we have lived for a hundred and thirty years declares: "We, the people of the United States in order to . . . provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution." The Constitution so ordained, vests in Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and it vests in the President the power to command the army and navy. The power in this instance was exercised not suddenly or rashly, but advisedly, after a long delay and discussion, and patience under provocation, after repeated diplomatic warnings to Germany known to the whole country, after clear notice by breach of diplomatic relations with Germany that the question was imminent, after long opportunity for reflection and discussion following that notice, and after a formal and deliberate presentation by the President to Congress of the reasons for action, in an address which compelled the attention not of Congress alone, but of all Americans and of all the world, and which must forever stand as one of the great state papers of modern times. The decision was made by overwhelming majorities of both houses of Congress. When such a decision has been made, the duties — and therefore the rights — of all the people of the country immediately change. It becomes their duty to stop discussion upon the question decided, and to act, to proceed immediately to do everything in their power to enable the government of their country to succeed in the war upon which the country has entered.

It is a fundamental necessity of government that it shall have the power to decide great questions of policy, and to act upon its decision. In order that there shall be action following a decision once made, the decision must be accepted. Discussion upon the question must be deemed closed. A nation which declares war and goes on discussing whether it ought to have declared war or not, is impotent, paralyzed, imbecile, and earns the contempt of mankind, and the certainty of humiliating defeat and subjection to foreign control. A democracy which cannot accept its own decisions made in accordance with its own laws, but must keep on endlessly discussing the questions already decided, has failed in the fundamental requirements of self-government; and, if the decision is to make war, the failure to exhibit capacity for self-government by action will inevitably result in the loss of the right of self-government. Before the decision of a proposal to make war, men may range themselves upon one side or the other of the question; but, after the decision in favor of war, the country has ranged itself, and the only issue left for the individual citizen to decide is whether he is for or against his country. From that time on, arguments against the war in which the country is engaged are enemy arguments. Their spirit is the spirit of rebellion against the government and laws of the United States. Their effect is to hinder and lessen that popular support of the government in carrying on the war which is necessary to success. Their manifest purpose is to prevent action by continuing discussion. They encourage the enemy. They tend to introduce delay and irresolution into our own councils. The men who are today speaking and writing and printing arguments against the war, and against everything which is being done to carry on the war, are rendering more effective service to Germany than they ever could render in the field with arms in their hands. The purpose and effect of what they are

doing is so plain that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the greater part of them are at heart traitors to the United States, and are wilfully seeking to bring about the triumph of Germany and the humiliation and defeat of their own country.

The same principles apply to the decision of numerous questions which arise in carrying on the war. Somebody must decide such questions before there can be action, and, when they are decided, the action can be only in accordance with the decision. You may be opposed to raising an army in one way, and I may be opposed to raising it in another way; and so long as the question is undecided, we are entitled to try to get our own views about it adopted; but we do not have the decision. The whole of the American people have elected a President and Congress to listen to your views and to mine, and then to decide the question. When they have decided, and a law has been passed which provides for raising part of the army by voluntary enlistment and part of the army by conscription, it is plain that the only way in which we can raise an army and go on with the war is by accepting that decision, and following that law; and any attempt to discourage volunteering or to oppose conscription is an attempt to hinder and embarrass the Government of the United States in the conduct of the war, and to help Germany by preventing our Government from raising armies to fight against her.

Somebody has to decide where armies are to fight, whether our territory is to be defended by waiting here until we are attacked, or by going out and attacking the enemy before they get here. The power to make that decision and the duty to make it rest, under the Constitution of this country, with the President as commander-in-chief. When the President has decided that the best way to beat Germany is to send our troops to France and Belgium, that is the way the

war must be carried on, if at all. I think the decision was wise. Others may think it unwise. But when the decision has been made, what we think is immaterial. The Commander-in-Chief, with all the advice and all the wisdom he can command, has decided when and where the American army is to move. The army must obey, and all loyal citizens of the country will do their utmost to make that movement a success. Anybody who seeks by argument or otherwise to stop the execution of the order sending troops to France and Belgium, is simply trying to prevent the American Government from carrying on the war successfully. He is aiding the enemies of his country; and, if he understands what he is really doing, he is a traitor at heart.

It is beyond doubt that many of the professed pacifists, the opponents of the war after the war has been entered upon, the men who are trying to stir up resistance to the draft, the men who are inciting strikes in the particular branches of production which are necessary for the supply of arms and munitions of war, are intentionally seeking to aid Germany and to defeat the United States. As time goes on, and the character of these acts becomes more and more clearly manifest, all who continue to associate with them must come under the same condemnation as traitors to their country.

There are doubtless some who do not understand what this struggle really is. Some who were born here resent interference with their comfort and prosperity, and the demands for sacrifice which seem to them unnecessary, and they fail to see that the time has come when, if Americans are to keep the independence and liberty which their fathers won by suffering and sacrifice, they in their turn must fight again for the preservation of that independence and that liberty. There are some born abroad who have come to this land for a greater freedom and broader opportunities, and have sought and received the privilege of American citizenship, who are

swayed by dislike for some ally or by the sympathies of German kinship, and fail to see that the time has come for them to make good the obligations of their sworn oaths of naturalization. This is the oath that the applicant for citizenship makes:

That he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty: . . . that he will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to the same.¹

All these naturalized citizens who are taking part in this obstruction to our Government in the conduct of the war are false to their oaths, are forfeiting their rights of citizenship, are repudiating their honorable obligations, are requiting by evil the good that has been done them in the generous and unstinted hospitality with which the people of the United States have welcomed them to the liberty and the opportunities of this free land. We must believe that in many cases this is done because of a failure to understand what this war really is.

This is a war of defense. It is perfectly described in the words of the Constitution which established this nation: "To provide for the common defense," and "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The national defense demands not merely force, but intelligence. It requires foresight, consideration of the policies and purposes of other nations, understanding of the inevitable or probable consequences of the acts of other nations, judgment as to the time when successful defense may be made, and when it will be too late, and prompt action before it is too late. By entering this war in April, the United States availed itself of the very last opportunity to defend itself against

¹ 34 United States Statutes at Large, Part I, pp. 597-598.

subjection to German power before it was too late to defend itself successfully.

For many years we have pursued our peaceful course of internal development, protected in a variety of ways. We have been protected by the law of nations to which all civilized governments have professed their allegiance. So long as we committed no injustice ourselves we could not be attacked without a violation of that law. We were protected by a series of treaties under which all the principal nations of the earth agreed to respect our rights and to maintain friendship with us. We were protected by an extensive system of arbitration created by, or consequent upon, the peace conferences at The Hague, and under which all controversies arising under the law and under treaties were to be settled peaceably, by arbitration and not by force. We were protected by the broad expanse of ocean separating us from all great military powers, and by the bold assertion of the Monroe Doctrine, that if any of those powers undertook to overpass the ocean and establish itself upon these western continents, that action would be regarded as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, and would call upon us to act in our defense. We were protected by the fact that the policy and the fleet of Great Britain were well known to support the Monroe Doctrine. We were protected by the delicate balance of power in Europe, which made it seem not worth while for any power to engage in a conflict here at the risk of suffering from its rivals there.

All these protections were swept away by the war which began in Europe in 1914. The war was begun by the concerted action of Germany and Austria, — the invasion of Servia by Austria on the east, and the invasion of Luxembourg and Belgium by Germany on the west. Both invasions were in violation of the law of nations, and in violation of the faith of treaties. Everybody knew that Russia was

bound in good faith to come to the relief of Servia, that France was bound by treaty to come to the aid of Russia, that England was bound by treaty to come to the aid of Belgium, so that the invasion of those two small states was the beginning of a general European war. These acts which have drenched the world with blood were defended and justified in the bold avowal of the German Government that the interests of the German State were superior to the obligations of law and the faith of treaties; that no law or treaty was binding upon Germany which it was for the interest of Germany to violate. All pretense of obedience to the law of nations and of respect for solemn promises was thrown off; and in lieu of that system of lawful and moral restraint upon power which Christian civilization has been building up for a century, was reinstated the cynical philosophy of Frederick the Great, the greatest of the Hohenzollerns, who declared:

If possible, the powers of Europe should be made envious against one another, in order to give occasion for a *coup* when the opportunity arises.¹

If a ruler is obliged to sacrifice his own person for the welfare of his subjects, he is all the more obliged to sacrifice treaty engagements, the continuance of which would be harmful to his country. Is it better that a nation should perish, or that a sovereign should break his treaty?²

Statesmanship can be reduced to three principles: — First, to maintain your power, and, according to circumstances, to extend it. Second, to form an alliance only for your own advantage. Third, to command fear and respect, even in the most disastrous times.³

¹ *Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand/XIV/Exposé du Gouvernement Prussien/Des Principes sur lesquels il roule, avec quelques réflexions politiques.* Berlin: 1848, vol. 9, p. 188.

² *Histoire de mon temps, tome I, Avant-propos, pp. xxvi-xxvii. Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand, roi de Prusse* (Berlin, 1846-8), tome II.

³ *Les Matinées Royales, ou l'art de régner: Opuscule inédit de Frédéric II, dit le Grand, roi de Prusse*: London, Williams and Morgate, 1863, p. 29. This little book, consisting of five of the seven *Matinées Royales*, was edited by the late Lord Acton from a copy of the original work at Sans Souci in 1806, by Baron de Ménéval, private secretary to Napoleon. As regards the authenticity of the *Matinées Royales*, see an article entitled "The Confessions of Frederick the Great" and a review of "Buffon: sa famille, ses collaborateurs et ses familiers": *Mémoires par M. Humberl-Bazile, son serrétaire; mis en ordre, annotés et augmentés de docu-*

Do not be ashamed of making interested alliances from which you yourself can derive the whole advantage. Do not make the foolish mistake of not breaking them when you believe your interests require it. . . .

Above all, uphold the following maxim: — To despoil your neighbors is to deprive them of the means of injuring you.¹

When he is about to conclude a treaty with some foreign power, if a sovereign remembers he is a Christian, he is lost.²

From 1914 until the present, in a war waged with a revolting barbarity unequalled since the conquests of Genghis Khan, Germany has violated every rule agreed upon by civilized nations in modern times to mitigate the barbarities of war or to protect the rights of non-combatants and neutrals. She had no grievance against Belgium except that Belgium stood upon her admitted rights and refused to break the faith of her treaties by consenting that the neutrality of her territory should be violated to give Germany an avenue for the attack upon France. The German Kaiser has taken possession of the territory of Belgium and subjected her people to the hard yoke of a brutal soldiery. He has extorted vast sums from her peaceful cities. He has burned her towns, and battered down her noble churches. He has stripped the Belgian factories of their machinery, and deprived them of the raw materials of manufacture. He has carried away her workmen by tens of thousands into slavery, and her women into worse than slavery. He has slain peaceful non-combatants by the hundred, undeterred by the helplessness of age, of infancy, or of womanhood. He has done the same in Northern France, in Poland, in Servia, in Rumania. In all of these countries women have been outraged by the thousand, by tens of thousands, and who ever heard of a German soldier being punished for rape, or robbery, or murder? These revolting outrages upon humanity and law are not the casual

ments inédits par M. Henri Nadault de Buffon (Paris: Renouard), in the *Home and Foreign Review* for 1868, pp. 152-171, 704-711.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

incidents of war; they are the results of a settled policy of frightfulness answering to the maxim of the Great Frederick to "command respect through fear."

Why were these things done by Germany? The answer rests upon the accumulated evidence of German acts and German words so conclusive that no pretense can cover it, no sophistry can disguise it. The answer is, that this war was begun and these crimes against humanity were done because Germany was pursuing the hereditary policy of the Hohenzollerns, and following the instincts of the arrogant military caste which rules Prussia, to grasp the over-lordship of the civilized world and establish an empire in which she should play the rôle of ancient Rome. They were done because Prussian militarism still pursues the policy of power through conquest, of aggrandizement through force and fear, which in little more than two centuries has brought the puny Mark of Brandenburg with its million and a half of people, to the control of a vast empire, -- the greatest armed force of the modern world. It now appears beyond all possibility of doubt, that this war was made by Germany in pursuit of a long and settled purpose. For many years she had been preparing to do exactly what she has done, with a thoroughness, a perfection of plans, and a vastness of provision in men, munitions and supplies, never before equalled or approached in human history. She brought on the war when she chose, because she chose, in the belief that she could conquer the earth nation by nation.

All nations are egotistical, all peoples think most highly of their own qualities, and regard other peoples as inferior; but the egotism of the ruling class in Prussia is beyond all example, and it is active and aggressive. They believe that Germany is entitled to rule the world by virtue of her superiority in all those qualities which they include under the term *Kultur*, and by reason of her power to compel submission by

the sword. That belief does not evaporate in theory. It is translated into action, and this war is the action which results. This belief in national superiority and the right to assert it everywhere is a tradition from the Great Frederick. It has been instilled into the minds of the German people through all the universities and schools. It has been preached from her pulpits and taught by her philosophers and historians. It has been maintained by her government, and it will never cease to furnish the motive for the people of Prussia, so long as German power enables the military autocracy of Prussia to act upon it with success.

Plainly, if the power of the German government is to continue, America can no longer look for protection to the law of nations, or the faith of treaties, or the instincts of humanity, or the restraints of modern civilization.

Plainly, also, if we had stayed out of the war, and Germany had won, there would no longer have been a balance of power in Europe, or a British fleet to support the Monroe Doctrine and to protect America.

Does any one indulge in the foolish assumption that Germany would not then have extended her lust for power by conquest, to the American Continent? Let him consider what it is for which the nations of Europe have been chiefly contending for centuries past. It has been for colonies. It has been to bring the unoccupied or weakly-held spaces of the earth under their flags and their political control, in order to increase their trade and their power. Spain, Holland, Portugal, England, France, have all had their turn, and have covered the earth with their possessions. For thirty years Germany, the last comer, has been pressing forward with feverish activity the acquisition of stations for her power on every coast and every sea, restive and resentful because she has been obliged to take what others have left. Europe, Asia, and Africa have been taken up. The Americas alone remain.

Here in the vast and undefended spaces of the New World, fraught with potential wealth incalculable, Germany could "find her place in the sun," to use her Emperor's phrase; Germany could find her "liberty of national evolution," to use his phrase again. Every traditional policy, every instinct of predatory Prussia would urge her into this new field of aggrandizement. What would prevent? The Monroe Doctrine? Yes. But what is the Monroe Doctrine against a nation which respects only force, unless it can be maintained by force? We already know how the German Government feels about the Monroe Doctrine. Bismarck declared it to be a piece of colossal impudence; and when President Roosevelt interfered to assert the doctrine for the protection of Venezuela, the present Kaiser declared that if he had then had a larger navy he would have taken America by the scruff of the neck. If we had stayed out of the war, and Germany had won, we should have had to defend the Monroe Doctrine by force, or abandon it; and if we abandoned it, there would have been a German naval base in the Caribbean commanding the Panama Canal, depriving us of that strategic line which unites our eastern and western coasts, and depriving us of the protection which the expanse of ocean once gave. And an America unable or unwilling to protect herself against the establishment of a German naval base in the Caribbean would lie at the mercy of Germany, subject to Germany's orders. America's independence would be gone unless she was ready to fight for it, and her security would thenceforth be, not the security of freedom, but only a security purchased by submission.

But if America had stayed out of the war and Germany had won, could we have defended the Monroe Doctrine? Could we have maintained our independence? For an answer to this question, consider what we have been doing since the second of April last, when war was declared. Con-

gress has been in continuous session, passing with unprecedented rapidity laws containing grants of power and of money unexampled in our history. The executive establishment has been straining every nerve to prepare for war. The ablest and strongest leaders of industrial activity have been called from all parts of the country to aid the Government. The people of the country have generously responded with noble loyalty and enthusiasm to the call for the surrender of money and of customary rights, and the supply of men, to the service of the country. Nearly half a year has passed, and still we are not ready to fight. I am not blaming the Government. It was inevitable. Preparation for modern war cannot be made briefly or speedily. It requires time, long periods of time; and the more peaceful and unprepared for war a democracy is, the longer is the time required.

It would have required just as long for America to prepare for war if we had stayed out of this war, and Germany had won, and we had undertaken then to defend the Monroe Doctrine, or to defend our coasts when we had lost the protection of the Monroe Doctrine. Month after month would have passed with no adequate army ready to fight, just as these recent months have passed. But what would Germany have been doing to us in the meantime? How long would it have been before our attempts at preparation would have been stopped by German arms? A country that is forced to defend itself against the aggression of a military autocracy, always prepared for war, must itself be prepared for war beforehand, or it never will have the opportunity to prepare.

The history, the character, the avowed principles of action, the manifest and undisguised purposes of the German autocracy, made it clear and certain that if America stayed out of the great war, and Germany won, America would forthwith be required to defend herself, and would be unable to defend herself against the same lust for conquest, the same will to

dominate the world, which has made Europe a bloody shambles.

When Germany did actually apply her principles of action to us; when by the invasion of Belgium she had violated the solemn covenant she had made with us to observe the law of neutrality established for the protection of peaceful states; when she had arrogantly demanded that American commerce should surrender its lawful right of passage upon the high seas under penalty of destruction; when she had sunk American ships and sent to their death hundreds of American citizens, peaceful men, women, and children, when the *Gulf-light* and the *Falaba* and the *Persia* and the *Arabic* and the *Sussex* and the *Lusitania* had been torpedoed without warning in contempt of law and of humanity; when the German Embassy at Washington had been found to be the headquarters of a vast conspiracy of corruption within our country, inciting sedition and concealing infernal machines in the cargoes of our ships, and blowing up our factories with the workmen laboring in them; and when the Government of Germany had been discovered attempting to incite Mexico and Japan to form a league with her to attack us, and to bring about a dismemberment of our territory; then the question presented to the American people was not what shall be done regarding each of these specific aggressions taken by itself, but what shall be done by America to defend her commerce, her territory, her citizens, her independence, her liberty, her life as a nation, against the continuance of assaults already begun by that mighty and conscienceless power which has swept aside every restraint and every principle of Christian civilization, and is seeking to force upon a subjugated world the dark and cruel rule of a barbarous past. The question was, how shall peaceful and unprepared and liberty-loving America save herself from subjection to the military power of Germany?

There was but one possible answer. There was but one chance for rescue, and that was to act at once, while the other democracies of the world were still maintaining their liberty against the oppressor; to prepare at once while the armies and the navies of England and France and Italy and Russia and Rumania were holding down Germany so that she could not attack us while our preparation was but half accomplished, to strike while there were allies loving freedom like ourselves to strike with us, to do our share to prevent the German Kaiser from acquiring that domination over the world which would have left us without friends to aid us, without preparation, and without the possibility of successful defense.

The instinct of the American democracy which led it to act when it did, arose from a long-delayed and reluctant consciousness still vague and half-expressed, that this is no ordinary war which the world is waging. It is no contest for petty policies and profits. It is a mighty and all-embracing struggle between two conflicting principles of human right and human duty. It is a conflict between the divine right of kings to govern mankind through armies and nobles, and the right of the peoples of the earth who toil and endure and aspire, to govern themselves by law under justice, and in the freedom of individual manhood. It is the climax of the supreme struggle between autoocracy and democracy. No nation can stand aside and be free from its effects. The two systems cannot endure together in the same world. If autoocracy triumphs, military power, lustful of dominion, supreme in strength, intolerant of human rights, holding itself above the reach of law, superior to morals, to faith, to compassion, will crush out the free democracies of the world. If autoocracy is defeated and nations are compelled to recognize the rule of law and of morals, then and then only will democracy be safe.

To this great conflict for human rights and human liberty, America has committed herself. There can be no backward step. There must be either humiliating and degrading submission, or terrible defeat, or glorious victory. It was no human will that brought us to this pass. It was not the President. It was not Congress. It was not the press. It was not any political party. It was not any section or part of our people. It was the fact that in the providence of God the mighty forces that determine the destinies of mankind beyond the control of human purpose, have brought to us the time, the occasion, the necessity, that this peaceful people so long enjoying the blessings of liberty and justice for which their fathers fought and sacrificed, shall again gird themselves for conflict, and with all the forces of manhood nurtured and strengthened by liberty, offer again the sacrifice of possessions and of life itself, that this nation may still be free, that the mission of American democracy shall not have failed, that the world shall be free.

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF THE IMPERIAL JAPANESE MISSION, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 1, 1917

At a luncheon given at the Bankers' Club in New York City, October 1, 1917, by Messrs. Cutting, Baker, and Morgan, of that city, the toastmaster said that the distinguished guests were present to greet Viscount Ishii and his associates, and to express their feeling of amity toward the great nation they represented. They were present to emphasize their desire to do everything practical and possible to cement firmly and forever the friendly relations between the two great countries. He continued: "The first speaker on the program, his history, achievements, his position, are well known. I have the great honor of presenting America's foremost citizen, the Honorable Elihu Root."

Mr. Root spoke as follows:

I AM under great obligation to the hosts of this luncheon for giving me the opportunity to join in testifying to respect and admiration and warmth of friendship for the gentlemen who have come so far across the Pacific to extend to us assurances of the friendship of the great and wonderful nation which they represent.

I find myself, without any aid or suggestion on my part, put down upon the program to speak to the formal toast, "International Friendship." But neither the time, nor the character of such a meeting as this, would justify a long discussion of that rather broad subject. We are in midst of a transition which is deeply affecting international friendship. We are passing out of one condition of international relation into another and widely-differing condition. We recall the maxim of Frederick the Great, that a ruler should never be ashamed to make an alliance which was entirely for his own advantage, and should never hesitate to break it when it ceased to be for his advantage. And the further maxim, that

it was the duty of a ruler, when he found that a treaty was no longer beneficial to his people, to break it; for, he said, "Is it not better that a ruler should break his word than that his people should suffer?" A fine altruistic view of a ruler's duty, which regarded a treaty as being merely a matter between himself and another ruler, so that only his conscience was involved in the breaking of it and not at all the conscience of his people; so that if he would do that violence to his own nature which was involved in breaking a treaty for the benefit of his people, it was a noble self-sacrifice.

Now that illustrates the old condition of international relation. The relation was between rulers, between sovereigns, not between the peoples; and the sovereigns were pursuing their own settled policies — policies continued from generation to generation, always involving the possibility of aggrandizement, of increasing power, of increasing dominion; and the people were not interested in the slightest. All the great wars that have convulsed the world since the Peace of Westphalia have been, down to very recent days, wars in which some ruler was attempting to increase his power and his dominion, and other rulers were attempting to prevent him from increasing it. Now, however, the business of foreign affairs is passing into the hands of democracies; and in the hands of democracies the old evil of dynastic policies is disappearing; for democracies are incapable of maintaining or following the kind of policy which has involved the world in war so many, many times during the past centuries. A democracy cannot in its very nature pursue such a policy. The mere necessity of discussion, public discussion, in order to secure the appropriations, the expenditure of money, and the action of public representatives, the mere necessity for discussion, is destructive of such policies.

But we are running into other difficulties. Democracies have their dangers, and they have their dangers in foreign

affairs; and those dangers arise from the fact that the great mass of people have not the time or the opportunity, or in most cases, the capacity to study and understand the intricate and complicated relations which exist necessarily between nations. And being so situated that they cannot study the relations, cannot become familiar with the vast mass of facts which they involve, cannot become familiar with the characters and purposes of other nations, they are peculiarly open to misrepresentation and misunderstanding. The great danger to international relations with the democracies is misunderstanding, — a misunderstanding of one's own rights; a misunderstanding of one's own duties, and of the rights and duties of other peoples.

Now we are peculiarly open to that danger in this country. We have been so isolated from other nations that we have, in general, but very slender information regarding them, and we are peculiarly liable to be misled. It is only a very few years since the people of the United States really regarded the department of foreign relations as a perfectly useless bureau, and ambassadors and ministers as of no practical value at all. You would get a very large degree of assent ten years ago to the proposition that we might better abolish the whole childish folly, with all its fuss and feathers. Now we are passing out of that condition, and we are finding antidotes for that evil. This great war is teaching the people of every country, even the dullest and the most self-centered, that no nation can live unto itself alone. It is teaching the interdependence of mankind; it is teaching the unity of civilization; it is teaching the singleness of purpose that goes with duty and love of humanity, and the idealism that pervades all noble natures, whatever the language be and whatever the country be. In fact, more and more this war grows to be a conflict — not between nations, not between this, that, and the other people, but between certain principles of

modern civilization and the principles of a dark and dreadful past.

There never has been in this country, so far as my observation and reading go, any more dangerous and persistent misrepresentation regarding the relations, the purposes, the character of another country with which we have relations, than in the case of the relations between the United States and Japan. I have not the slightest doubt that the misrepresentations and the attempts to create bad feeling among the people who have it all in their hands now, — the attempts to create bad feeling between the United States and Japan, have been very largely the result of a fixed and settled purpose; and it is growing day by day more plain that this purpose has formed a part of the policy of that great ruling caste of Germany which is attempting to subjugate the world today. It goes back again to a maxim of the great Frederick, who advised his successors that it was wise to create jealousies among the nations of Europe, in order that they might not be an aid to each other when the opportunity came for a *coup*. That policy has been pursued everywhere in the civilized world. While Germany has been incapable of estimating the great moral forces that move mankind; while she has been incapable of forming a judgment as to what were the real temper and spirit of England, of the British colonies, of the American republic, of the French republic, of the Italian constitutional monarchy, she has had a chemical affinity for everything that is base in every country. She has appealed to all the baser feelings and conditions; she has appealed to cupidity; she has appealed to prejudice, and to all the lower passions of men everywhere in the world. Wherever she could array evil against good; wherever she could destroy content and neighborliness and respect for law, and the desire for the better things of life, there she has been working to subjugate. All the baser passions received

impetus, fuel, encouragement from her, and a part of her effort has been, I have no doubt whatever, to create estrangement, if possible, between the United States and Japan.

Now I wish in the first place to express my own most grateful appreciation of the fine and noble way in which the Viscount Ishii and his Mission, inspired and commissioned by the Government of Japan, have come to America to dispel all this cloud of misunderstanding and suspicion and doubt. The frank and sincere utterances of the Viscount are like rays of sun dispelling the cloud. There is very great virtue in speaking face to face. There is great virtue in letting in the light. There is a good quality in human nature which makes men like each other and trust each other the more, when they meet each other face to face; and I think it certain that the visit of this Mission to America begins a new era of understanding and friendship between these two great nations that look at each other across the Pacific, which will revive memories of the days past, of those early years in which this great republic served its part in introducing the new Japan to the nations of the world.

I wish to say one other thing. For many years I was very familiar with our own department of foreign affairs, and for some years I was specially concerned in its operation. During that time there were many difficult, perplexing, and doubtful questions to be discussed and settled between the United States and Japan. During that time the thoughtless or malicious section of the press was doing its worst. During that time the demagogue, seeking cheap reputation by stirring up the passions of the people to whom he appealed, was doing his worst. There were many incidents out of which quarrels and conflict might have arisen; and I hope you will all remember what I say of them: I say that during all that period there never was a moment when the Government of Japan was not frank, sincere, friendly, and most solicitous,

not to enlarge but to minimize and do away with all causes of controversy. No one who has any familiarity at all with life can be mistaken in a negotiation as to whether the one with whom he is negotiating is trying to prevent or trying to bring about a quarrel. That is a fundamental thing that you cannot be mistaken about. And there never was a more consistent and noble advocacy of peace, of international friendship, and of real good understanding, in the diplomacy of this world, than was exhibited by the representatives of Japan, both here and in Japan, during all these years in their relations to the United States. I wish for no better, no more frank and friendly intercourse between my country and any other country than the intercourse by which Japan in those years illustrated the best qualities of the new diplomacy between nations, as distinguished from the old diplomacy between rulers.

And in the most delightful recollection of those years, and most agreeable appreciation for what you have now done, I beg you, my dear Viscount, when you return to your home, that you will say to the Government and to the people of Japan: The people of America, who now hold their foreign affairs in their hands, wish to be forever friends and brethren of the people of Japan.

THE MISSION TO RUSSIA

THE MISSION TO RUSSIA

THE thirteen British colonies of America which joined in the declaration of independence on July 4, 1776, laid down certain principles which were revolutionary then and now, and which will engender revolutions until they shall triumph, not merely in the minds and hearts of men, but in the form of government and in the practice of nations.

The last people to confess its faith in the right to alter or abolish a form of government which had become destructive of the ends for which it was formed, and to institute a new government "as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness" is the Russian people; and like the revolutionary statesmen of 1776, the revolutionary statesmen of Russia of 1917 have issued an appeal to the peoples in accordance with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

We do not know at present the history of the movement which resulted in the abdication of the Romanoffs and the substitution in their place of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." We know that the leaders of thought in Russia have prayed, have lived, have worked, have died for better things, and we who believe in better things know that they have not worked and died in vain. The immediate cause of the overthrow of the Romanoff dynasty seems to have been the issue of two *ukases* suspending the sittings of the Duma and the Council of the Empire; but behind these was the longing for better things which took advantage of the condition produced by the unwiseom of the Czar, just as it would have taken advantage of a favorable turn of affairs at some future time.

On March 15, 1917, the Czar abdicated the throne, which was in fact no longer his, in favor of his brother, Grand Duke Michael, and the latter, either believing in the American doctrine of the consent of the governed or not quite sure that the brother could pass title to what he no longer possessed, would apparently have none of it unless the people would insist upon his accepting the throne. The following is the text of the Czar's abdication:

We, Nicholas II, by the Grace of God, Emperor of all the Russias, Czar of Poland, and Grand Duke of Finland, etc., make known to all our faithful subjects:

In the day of the great struggle against a foreign foe, who has been striving for three years to enslave our country, God has wished to send to Russia new and painful trial. Interior troubles threaten to have a fatal repercussion on the final outcome of the war. The destinies of

Russia and the honor of our heroic army, the happiness of the people, and all the future of our dear Fatherland require that the war be prosecuted at all cost to a victorious end. The cruel enemy is making his last effort, and the moment is near when our valiant army, in concert with those of our glorious Allies, will definitely chastise the foe.

In these decisive days in the life of Russia we believe our people should have the closest union and organization of all their forces for the realization of speedy victory. For this reason, in accord with the Duma of the Empire, we have considered it desirable to abdicate the throne of Russia and lay aside our supreme power.

Not wishing to be separated from our loved son, we leave our heritage to our brother, the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovitch, blessing his advent to the throne of Russia. We hand over the Government to our brother in full union with the representatives of the nation who are seated in the legislative chambers, taking this step with an inviolable oath in the name of our well-beloved country.

We call on all faithful sons of the Fatherland to fulfill their sacred patriotic duty in this painful moment of national trial and to aid our brother and the representatives of the nation in bringing Russia into the path of prosperity and glory. May God aid Russia.

The following is the text of the Grand Duke Michael's statement:

This heavy responsibility has come to me at the voluntary request of my brother, who has transferred the imperial throne to me during a period of warfare which is accompanied with unprecedented popular disturbances.

Moved by the thought, which is in the minds of the entire people, that the good of the country is paramount, I have adopted the firm resolution to accept the supreme power only if this be the will of our great people, who, by a plebiscite organized by their representatives in a constituent assembly, shall establish a form of government and new fundamental laws for the Russian State.

Consequently, invoking the benediction of our Lord, I urge all citizens of Russia to submit to the Provisional Government, established upon the initiative of the Duma and invested with full plenary powers, until such time, which will follow with as little delay as possible, as the Constituent Assembly, on a basis of universal, direct, equal, and secret suffrage, shall, by its decision as to the new form of government, express the will of the people.

The following, omitting the names of the Cabinet, is the text of the appeal of the Executive Committee, a charter of liberty and of a nation's hope:

Citizens: The Executive Committee of the Duma, with the aid and support of the garrison of the capital and its inhabitants, has succeeded in triumphing over the obnoxious forces of the old régime in such a manner that we are able to proceed to a more stable organization of the executive power, with men whose past political activity assures them the country's confidence.

[The names of the members of the new Government are then given and the appeal continues:]

The new Cabinet will base its policy on the following principles:

First — An immediate general amnesty for all political and religious offenses, including terrorist acts and military and agrarian offenses.

Second — Liberty of speech and of the press; freedom for alliances, unions, and strikes, with the extension of these liberties to military officials within the limits admitted by military requirements.

Third — Abolition of all social, religious, and national restrictions.

Fourth — To proceed forthwith to the preparation and convocation of a constitutional assembly, based on universal suffrage, which will establish a governmental régime.

Fifth — The substitution of the police by a national militia, with chiefs to be elected and responsible to the Government.

Sixth — Communal elections to be based on universal suffrage.

Seventh — The troops which participated in the revolutionary movement will not be disarmed, but will remain in Petrograd.

Eighth — While maintaining strict military discipline for troops on active service, it is desirable to abrogate for soldiers all restrictions in the enjoyment of social rights accorded other citizens.

The Provisional Government desires to add that it has no intention to profit by the circumstances of the war to delay the realization of the measures of reform above mentioned.

On March 22, 1917, the American ambassador to Russia, the Honorable David R. Francis, formally recognized the Provisional Government on behalf of the United States, in the following language:

I have the honor as the ambassador and representative of the Government of the United States accredited to Russia, to state in accordance with instructions, that the Government of the United States has recognized the new Government of Russia, and I, as ambassador of the United States, will be pleased to continue intercourse with Russia through the medium of the new Government. May the cordial relations existing between the two countries continue to obtain. May they prove mutually satisfactory and beneficial.

Paul Milukoff, the Russian Foreign Minister, replied in the following words:

Permit me, in the name of the Provisional Government, to answer the act of recognition by the United States. You have been able to follow the events which have established the new order of affairs for free Russia. I have been more than once in your country, and can bear witness that the ideals which are represented by the Provisional Government are the same as underlie the existence of your own nation. I hope that this great change which has come to Russia will do much to bring us closer together than we have ever been before. During the last few days I have received many congratulations from prominent men in your country, assuring me that the public opinion of the United States is in sympathy with us. Permit me to thank you. We are proud to be first recognized by a nation whose ideals we cherish.

On May 12, 1917, the Department of State thus announced the members of a Special Diplomatic Mission of the United States of America to Russia:

ELIHU ROOT, of New York, *Ambassador Extraordinary.*

CHARLES R. CRANE, of Illinois,

JOHN R. MOTT, of New York,

CYRUS H. McCORMICK, of Illinois,

SAMUEL R. BERTRON, of New York,

JAMES DUNCAN, of Massachusetts,

CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL, of New York,

Major-General HUGH L. SCOTT, } *Ministers representing the*

Rear-Admiral JAMES H. GLENNON, } *Army and Navy.*

President Wilson himself prepared and transmitted to the Provisional Government of Russia the following address:

In view of the approaching visit of the American Mission to Russia to express the deep friendship of the American people for the people of Russia, and to discuss the best and most practical means of coöperation between the two peoples in carrying the present struggle for the freedom of all peoples to a successful consummation, it seems opportune and appropriate that I should state again, in the light of this new partnership, the objects the United States has had in mind in entering the war. Those objects have been very much beclouded during the past few weeks by mistaken and misleading statements, and the issues at stake are too momentous, too tremendous, too significant for the whole human race, to permit any misinterpretations or misunderstandings, however slight, to remain uncorrected for a moment.

The war has begun to go against Germany, and in their desperate desire to escape the inevitable ultimate defeat, those who are in

authority in Germany are using every possible instrumentality, are making use even of the influence of groups and parties among their own subjects to whom they have never been just or fair, or even tolerant, to promote a propaganda on both sides of the sea which will preserve for them their influence at home and their power abroad, to the undoing of the very men they are using.

The position of America in this war is so clearly avowed that no man can be excused for mistaking it. She seeks no material profit or aggrandizement of any kind. She is fighting for no advantage or selfish object of her own, but for the liberation of peoples everywhere from the aggressions of autoocratic force.

The ruling classes in Germany have begun of late to profess a like liberality and justice of purpose, but only to preserve the power they have set up in Germany and the selfish advantages which they have wrongly gained for themselves and their private projects of power all the way from Berlin to Bagdad and beyond. Government after Government has by their influence, without open conquest of its territory, been linked together in a net of intrigue directed against nothing less than the peace and liberty of the world. The meshes of that intrigue must be broken, but cannot be broken unless wrongs already done are undone; and adequate measures must be taken to prevent it from ever again being rewoven or repaired.

Of course, the Imperial German Government and those whom it is using for their own undoing are seeking to obtain pledges that the war will end in the restoration of the *status quo ante*. It was the *status quo ante* out of which this iniquitous war issued forth, the power of the Imperial German Government within the Empire and its widespread domination and influence outside of that Empire. That status must be altered in such fashion as to prevent any such hideous thing from ever happening again.

We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and the undictated development of all peoples, and every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. Wrongs must first be righted, and then adequate safeguards must be created to prevent their being committed again. We ought not to consider remedies merely because they have a pleasing and sonorous sound. Practical questions can be settled only by practical means. Phrases will not accomplish the result. Effective readjustments will, and whatever readjustments are necessary must be made.

But they must follow a principle, and that principle is plain. No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish

to live. No territory must change hands except for the purpose of securing those who inhabit it a fair chance of life and liberty. No indemnities must be insisted on except those that constitute payment for manifest wrongs done. No readjustments of power must be made except such as will tend to secure the future peace of the world and the future welfare and happiness of its peoples.

And then the free peoples of the world must draw together in some common covenant, some genuine and practical coöperation, that will in effect combine their force to secure peace and justice in the dealings of nations with one another.

The brotherhood of mankind must no longer be a fair but empty phrase; it must be given a structure of force and reality. The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing power.

For these things we can afford to pour out blood and treasure. For these are the things we have always professed to desire; and unless we pour out blood and treasure now and succeed, we may never be able to unite or show conquering force again in the great cause of human liberty. The day has come to conquer or submit. If the forces of autocracy can divide us they will overcome us; if we stand together victory is certain and the liberty which victory will secure. We can afford then to be generous, but we cannot afford then or now to be weak or omit any single guarantee of justice and security.

On June 13, the Mission arrived in Petrograd. It left Petrograd on its return July 9, sailing from Vladivostok July 21, and during this interval Mr. Root delivered the addresses contained in this section of the present volume, and members of the Mission delivered addresses which, together with Mr. Root's reprinted from this volume, are published in separate form. The addresses Mr. Root delivered in the United States upon his return from the Russian mission are likewise included in this volume and are among the addresses collected and issued in the separate reprint.

On April 16, 1816, the great Napoleon is reported by De las Casas to have said, after referring to the perilous situation in which the continent of Europe then was, that "in the present state of things before one hundred years all Europe may be all Cossack or all republican." Let us hope that, whether Cossack or republican, the new Europe will accept the principles of the Declaration of Independence of the United States and make them realities.

In selecting a chairman for the Russian Diplomatic Mission, President Wilson signified the importance he attached to it, by naming Elihu Root, who as Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and Senator of the United States has an international as well as a national reputation.

Mr. Root's profound and sympathetic interest in the Russian revolution had been evidenced, prior to his appointment, by letters addressed to officers of two public meetings held in New York City, to hearten, encourage, and acclaim the patriots who organized and piloted it. These letters appropriately introduce the series of addresses made by Mr. Root while in Russia, and since his return:

LETTER TO CHARLES R. FLINT, MARCH 24, 1917

I regret that I am prevented from attending the meeting to be held tomorrow evening by friends and sympathizers with the Russian people. I agree with your purpose. I look with satisfaction and joy upon the establishment of free self-government in Russia. I have confidence in the permanence of the new popular government, as against all possible reactions, for two main reasons.

The first reason is the admirable self-control which the leaders of the new government and their followers as well have exhibited. That is the supreme test of a people's capacity for self-government. All men worthy the name are brave. All men worthy the name are patriotic; but only those who can keep their heads cool, restrain their passions, and love justice even while they strike, are fit for popular self-government. The people of Russia are answering nobly to that test; and while they continue in the same spirit — as I believe they will — their new government will be impregnable against all reactionary movements.

The second ground for my confidence is that this wonderful change in Russia marches with and is part of the mighty and I believe irresistible movement of the whole world to substitute democracy for autocracy in human government, and to build up the structure of justice and liberty, of right and duty and service, from the bottom instead of accepting them from human superiors. No earthly power can reverse or stop that movement. It may appear to be delayed or hindered here and there, but it continually proceeds everywhere, nevertheless. No human power can put Russia back where she was but a few weeks ago. Whatever comes of good or ill, the old order cannot return. Russia must go on. She will go on, and the hopes and prayers of all liberty-loving people of America will go with her.

Let us rejoice that this terrible war, which the arrogant ambition of Prussian militarism has forced upon the world, has at last arrayed against the lingering autocracies of Germany, Austria, and Turkey the combined democracy of the world; that upon one side the spirit of the age maintains the principles of human liberty; that upon the other the spirit of the dark and cruel past strives for the continuance of absolutism. The issue is not doubtful. A little sooner or a little

later it is inevitable. The Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs will fall, and the mighty and universal forces of democracy will prevail.

Ah, if only the good people of Germany themselves might soon remember and breathe again the spirit of their earlier days — the spirit of '48, the spirit of the great philosophers and poets and leaders who inspired the patriots of that time with a passion for liberty!

Sincerely yours,

ELIHU ROOT.

LETTER TO AUGUSTUS THOMAS, SECRETARY OF THE INSTITUTE
OF ARTS AND LETTERS, NEW YORK, APRIL 17, 1917

I am unfortunate in having to be away from New York on the 23d, so that I shall be unable to attend the meeting of the Institute that evening to join in greeting and congratulation to the writers and artists of Russia upon the great achievement to which they have contributed so signally. They were the voice of Russia during the long years in which the Russian people were denied opportunity for political expression. Through them were communicated the impulses of sympathy and hope which made their people one with all their fellows in other lands, who were pressing on the development of democratic self-government and the extirpation of autocrats and dynasties. To these men whose vision and lofty courage have inspired the literature and art of modern Russia remains the task — even more critical and exacting — of guiding wisely their new free government. The conduct of that government has been admirable in its wisdom and self-restraint. Yet, there will be trials. Turbulent and untrained spirits within, and sinister and corrupt intrigue from without, will encourage dissension and seek to destroy the new democracy by creating those divisions and controversies which paralyze power. Faint hearts will be discouraged, and even the wisest will be often in doubt; but the power of democracy will prevail. Russia will not divide or be led astray, because the unity and stability of a forward-moving purpose will be hers. She will not fight her battle with her own self alone. She is one of a great company of free peoples who are giving the lie all over the world to the false dogmas of autocracy, and are proving the capacity of humble men to rule themselves with self-control and justice and respect for law, and to maintain their freedom with the power of union and subordination of self. Russia will not swing idly in an eddy, but will move on with the world stream, impelled by that mighty and irresistible force which urges on the development of thought in our time to the destruction of all autocratic government and the creation of universal democracy. Happy

must be our brothers, the writers and artists of Russia, to have lived to see the light of this wonderful day, and to grasp this opportunity for service.

I am sure the Institute of Arts and Letters in sending to them messages of cheer and hope will truly interpret the feeling of all America.

With kinds regards, I am,

Always faithfully yours,

ELIHU ROOT.

ADDRESS TO THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS PETROGRAD, JUNE 15, 1917

On June 15, 1917, the members of the Special Diplomatic Mission of the United States to the Provisional Government of Russia were presented to the president and members of the Provisional Council of Ministers at Petrograd, by the ambassador of the United States, the Honorable David R. Francis, who said:

Thoroughly imbued with the spirit of service, these Americans have cheerfully responded to the call of President Wilson, and are here to perform an important duty. I feel it a great honor to present this Special Diplomatic Mission of the United States to the Provisional Government of Russia.

Permit me to introduce to the Council of Ministers the distinguished chairman of the Mission, the Honorable Elihu Root, former Secretary of War, former Secretary of State, former Senator of the United States, always a true American.

Mr. Root thereupon made the following address:

THE Mission for which I have the honor to speak is charged by the Government and the people of the United States of America with a message to the Government and the people of Russia.

The Mission comes from a democratic republic. Its members are commissioned and instructed by a president who holds his high office as chief executive of more than one hundred million free people, by virtue of a popular election in which more than eighteen million votes were freely cast and fairly counted, pursuant to law, by universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage.

For one hundred and forty years our people have been struggling with the hard problems of self-government. With many shortcomings, many mistakes, many imperfections, we have still maintained order and respect for law, individual freedom, and national independence.

Under the security of our own laws we have grown in strength and prosperity, but we value our freedom more than

wealth. We love liberty, and we cherish above all our possessions the ideals for which our fathers fought and suffered and sacrificed, that America might be free. We believe in the competence and power of democracy, and in our heart of hearts abides a faith in the coming of a better world, in which the humble and oppressed in all lands may be lifted up by freedom to a heritage of justice and equal opportunity.

The news of Russia's new found freedom brought to America universal satisfaction and joy. From all the land, sympathy and hope went out towards the new sister in the circle of democracies; and this Mission is sent to express that feeling. The American democracy sends to the democracy of Russia, greeting, sympathy, friendship, brotherhood, and Godspeed.

Distant America knows little of the special conditions of Russian life, which must give form to the government and to the laws which you are about to create. As we have developed our institutions to serve the needs of our national character and life, so we assume that you will develop your institutions to serve the needs of Russian character and life. As we look across the sea we distinguish no party and no class. We see great Russia as a whole; as one mighty striving and aspiring democracy. We know the self-control, the essential kindness, the strong common-sense, the courage and the noble idealism of Russian character. We have faith in you all. We pray for God's blessings upon you all. We believe that you will solve your problems; that you will maintain your liberty, and that our two great nations will march side by side in the triumphant progress of democracy until the old order has everywhere passed away and the world is free.

One fearful danger threatens the liberty of both nations. The armed forces of military autocracy are at the gates of Russia and of her allies. The triumph of German arms will

mean the death of liberty in Russia. No enemy is at the gates of America, but America has come to realize that the triumph of German arms means the death of liberty in the world; that we who love liberty and would keep it must fight for it, and fight now when the free democracies of the world may be strong in union, and not delay until they may be beaten down separately in succession.

So America sends another message to Russia; that we are going to fight, and have already begun to fight, for your freedom equally with our own, and we ask you to fight for our freedom equally with yours. We would make your cause ours, and our cause yours, and with common purpose and the mutual helpfulness of firm alliance, make sure the victory over our common foe.

You will recognize your own sentiments and purposes in the words of President Wilson to the American Congress, when, on the second of April last, he advised the declaration of war against Germany. He said:

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a government [the German Government], following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept the gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included; for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

And you will see the feeling toward Russia with which America has entered the great war in another clause of the same address.

President Wilson further said:

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great generous Russian people have been added in all their naïve majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

That partnership of honor in the great struggle for human freedom, the oldest of the great democracies now seeks in fraternal union with the youngest.

The practical and specific methods and possibilities of our allied coöperation, the members of the Mission would be glad to discuss with the members of the Government of Russia.

REPLY OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Minister of Foreign Affairs Terestchenko replied to Mr. Root's address in English, as follows:

It is a great honor to me to have the pleasure of receiving this Mission which is sent by the American people and their President to freed Russia and to express the feelings of deep sympathy which the Provisional Government, representing the people of Russia, have toward your country.

The event of the great revolution which we have achieved, makes allies of the oldest and the newest republics in the

world. Our revolution was based on the same wonderful words which first were expressed in that memorable document in which the American people in 1776 declared their independence.

Just as the American people then declared:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.

So the Russian people, which for centuries have been enslaved by a government which was not that which the feeling of the nation wished or wanted, have so declared and shaken off the fetters which bound them, and as the wind blows away the leaves in autumn so the government which has bound us for centuries has fallen, and nothing is left but the free government of the people.

So the Russian people now stand before the world conscious of their strength and astonished at the ease with which that revolution happened, and the first days of our freedom indeed, brought surprise to us as well as to the rest of the world, but the day which brought the revolution was not only a day which brought freedom, for it brought us face to face with two enormous problems which now stand before the Russian people, and these problems are the creation of a

strong democratic force in the interior of Russia, and a fight with the common foe without, with that foe which is fighting you as well as us, and which is now the last form and last strength of autocracy; and it was with a feeling of gladness that we found you on the side of the Allies, and that after our revolution there was no autocracy among those with whom we found ourselves fighting. We found with joy that in the high, lofty motives which have impelled your great republic to enter this conflict there is no strain of autocracy or spirit of conquest, and our free people shall be guided by those same high, lofty motives and principles.

And now let us stand together, for we pursue the same endeavor in the war and in the peace which is to follow. We representatives of the Russian nation who have been placed at its head to lead the Russian nation through its hardships on its way to freedom, following these principles which have always brought a nation from complete slavery into complete freedom, are confident we shall find the way which will lead us side by side, not only the Russian peoples but its allies, along that way which will bring us to future happiness.

The revolution of Russia is a moral factor which shows the will of the Russian people in its endeavor to secure liberty and justice, and these elements the Russian people show and wish to show, not only in their internal affairs which we ourselves have to lead and in which we wish to be guided by these principles, but also in our international relations and in our international policies.

This war, which was brought upon us three years ago and which the Russian revolution found when it entered the struggle of free nations, left but one door for us to enter, and by that door we have entered and we shall continue in that path. These Russian people strive to the end of militarism and to a durable peace which would exclude every violence from whatever side it may come and all imperialistic schemes,

whatever their form may be. The Russian people have no wish of conquest or dominion and are opposed to those ideas in others, and first of all they will not allow any of those imperialistic desires which our enemy has formed, manifest or hidden, to come to good in whatever sphere he may have planned them, political, financial, or economic. This constitutes the firm will or what Russia has to guard herself against.

There is also a second great thought which was expressed by that memorable document by which the nation of the United States and its people at the day of their independence declared their desires and wishes, and which says that nations should have a right to show themselves the way they wish to go and to decide their own future, and this high principle the Russian people have accepted and consider that it must guide their politics; and they consider also that all nations, however small or great, have the right to decide what their future will be, and that no territory and no people can be transferred from one country to another without their consent. Human beings have the right to say for themselves what they shall do and whose subjects they shall become.

I am happy to see you, and happy to say that there is no idea or factor of a moral or material kind to divide us or to prevent us from being hand in hand across the Pacific. These two great people, the free people of Russia and the free people of America, the great people of the United States, the oldest, strongest, and purest democracy, hand in hand will show the way that human happiness will take in the future.

Allow me, therefore, to greet you, to welcome you in the name of my colleagues and of our government which represents our people and to say how happy we are to see you here.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE RUSSIAN-AMERICAN
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PETROGRAD
JUNE 21, 1917

ON behalf of the Mission for which I have the honor to speak, and in behalf of our country on the other side of the world, I thank you sincerely and warmly for this hospitable and sympathetic reception. It is very grateful to us to see upon this list of speakers the names of so many men distinguished in the active life of great Russia. It is very encouraging to us to see represented here the Provisional Government of Russia and the officers of those local governments, for the merit and perfection of which the Russian people have so long been known throughout the world, and the representatives of those great branches of finance and production and associated industries without which no modern civilization can exist.

The Mission has no function to discharge in respect to industrial or commercial life. That was intentionally excluded from the scope of its duty. We came to Russia to bring assurances of the spiritual brotherhood of the two great democracies, and we came, moreover, to learn how we could best do our part as allies of the Russian democracy by material as well as spiritual aid, in the great fight for the freedom of both our nations. But we did not wish that any element of advantage for America, any project for profit to America, any lower or more material motive should find its place in the message that we bring to Russia. Yet, when the war is over and the world is by victory made safe for democracy, then, of course, as between brothers who have fought together, mutual knowledge and confidence and friendship will lead to all those relations of industrial and commercial

life which make up the peaceful activities of the civilized world.

It was not easy, my friends, for America to make up its mind to enter the war. America is a peaceful people. We love peace and we hate war. Far away from the conflict across the ocean, it took us long to realize the true meaning of this great war in which you have been fighting, and it was not until we had slowly, step by step, reached the firm conclusion that our liberty was in danger with the liberty of the rest of the world, that we nerved ourselves to enter the conflict.

We came to see that Germany had foresworn and repudiated every principle of modern civilization. We came to see that all those rules for the conduct of war which for centuries civilized men have been formulating and agreeing upon to make war less terrible, every one of them was violated intentionally and systematically by Germany. We came to see that the principle of action of the military autoocracy that rules Germany was based upon a repudiation of all moral obligations of states. We came to see that Germany had avowed that the faith of treaties was nothing to her unless it was to her interest to keep them. We came to see that the law of nations was as naught to Germany when it thwarted her purposes. We came to see, finally, that the military power of Germany had brought back into the world the principles of action of those dark and dreadful days of a barbarous past when there was no liberty in the world, and that if mankind was to be free it must put an end to this powerful and ruthless enemy of freedom. And so, cheered and encouraged by the freedom of Russia, to be henceforth our ally and our friend, we entered the war, and we are going to fight until the world is made safe for democracy. For your democracy as well as ours. So that no arrogant, over-bearing, military caste shall push us off the sidewalk.

We are new to war. We have a small army. We cannot move at the beginning very rapidly, but we have enrolled for military service ten million men, between the ages of twenty and thirty. We have first to train officers, and the few thousand officers of the regular army are now engaged in various camps over the country in training some forty thousand young men as officers. As soon as they are sufficiently trained we shall call, and have ordered the call of five hundred thousand men to be trained by those officers. Then we shall repeat the operation, training more officers and having them train more men, and go on so long as it is necessary to win this war. We are mobilizing all the industries of the country. Congress has by law put under the control of the President over 250,000 miles of American railroads. All the manufacturing establishments are put under the direction of the general government and required to manufacture war materials, supplies, and munitions at no greater profit than is allowed by the government as being fair and reasonable. The entire food production of the country is put under the direction of a chief of food control, and that chief is the gentleman who has had charge of the Belgian relief work during the past three years, Herbert C. Hoover. We have set all the shipyards in the country at work to build ships by the thousand to take the place in the transport of supplies of those vessels which are destroyed by the German U-boats. In the meantime, we are sending a division to the lines in France and Belgium to fight there as an advance guard of American soldiers, by the side of the soldiers of Belgium, France, England, and Russia, who are fighting there. In the meantime, our ships of war are already in European waters engaged in the crusade against the U-boats which are destroying the peaceful vessels of commerce that are carrying supplies to Russia and England and France and Italy.

We offer you no comradeship of ease, no grudging or stinted coöperation, but the assurance of action, action, action, until the time when the new democracy of Russia, crowned with the greatest achievement of history, may stand side by side with the old republic of the United States.

Now indulge me while I say a word to my American friends here. It is not enough, my friends and brothers from America in Russia, it is not enough that our Government sends its message to Russia. It is not enough that the people of America look from the other side of the world with hope and courage to Russia. You Americans who are here in Russia represent your country. Your attitude towards the Russian democracy and your spirit will be interpreted as the spirit of democracy in America. Your fathers and mine did not win and maintain our liberty by pessimism. We won our liberty and we have maintained it for these centuries by confidence in the power of democracy, by faith in the people. We have maintained peace and order and liberty by respect for law and by holding up the hands of the Government. Whether it was an established and settled government, or a provisional government, or a revolutionary government, that government which represents at the time the will of the people for the maintenance of law and order and associated effort in behalf of liberty and justice, that government your fathers and mine have always maintained. Upon your Americanism, upon your loyalty to your own country, do it now, here. Carry no faint hearts about the streets of Petrograd. Teach these people in Russia, who are new to the government of democracy, that you, who are old to it, have faith in it and they will gain added faith and loyalty and support for their government from your faith; and so you will be in harmony with the people you have left at home, who believe in Russia and have hope and courage for Russia and pray for Russia.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE SOCIAL ASSOCIATED COMMITTEES OF MOSCOW, JUNE 22, 1917

THE Mission for which I speak was sent to Russia to express the sympathy of the United States, of the entire democracy of the United States, for the Russian people in their new found freedom, and their struggle to create and maintain orderly self-government. It is not in prosperity and ease that one's sympathies go out to a friend, but in struggle, in conflict, when the hard tasks of life are to be accomplished. There is no phase or part of Russian life with which the people of America sympathize more deeply than they do with you in the work that you are now striving to accomplish. We can sympathize with it because we have been through it ourselves. We have made many mistakes, we still are imperfect in our government, and we know how hard it is for a people to govern themselves in accordance with the laws of justice and humanity. And we have had more than one hundred and thirty years to accomplish our task, while you have had but three months.

It is not, Mr. President, that we see in the happenings in Russia since we came cause for criticism, but we marvel at the self-control, the kindness of spirit, and the sound common sense that the Russian people have displayed. Believe me, we feel that in the work that you are doing in these committees you are on the right path towards an assured and permanent democracy. For popular self-government must come not from above; not by fine theories; not by formulas, but it must come from the willing participation of all the people who govern themselves. That independence of individual character which is cultivated and developed by

individual effort for the public good is the solid foundation for free government. It is the hope and prayer of the American people that you may have full scope and opportunity to develop yourselves, your free government, in accordance with the needs of your character and your life in Russia. It is a cause of joy to the democratic people of the United States if they can help to give to the Russian people the opportunity to work out their own system of government in accordance with the genius of Russian character. It is a cause of joy to us if we can help to keep the new Russian democracy from being prevented, by the terrible military power of Germany, from establishing and developing their own free government. We have learned in free America that the system of government, the principles, the motives, and the methods of German military autocracy will be fatal to our liberty and fatal to yours; and we rejoice that we can help to save both great democracies from that frightful danger. The government of Germany, the social system of Germany, the socialism of Germany, are all militaristic in their essential nature. They shall not find control in free America, and if we can help you to prevent their finding control in free Russia, we shall be happy in feeling that we have done something towards perpetuating the ideals of our fathers who fought and sacrificed to make us free.

I thank you for listening so kindly to me and for permitting me to come before you to speak. I will close by saying that the people of America are all a working people; they work hard, early and late; they love liberty and they work for it; and their hearts go out to you who are working for the liberty and honor of your country, because they recognize you as brothers in a common cause. Long live Free Russia and Free America!

ADDRESS BEFORE THE MOSCOW DUMA,
JUNE 22, 1917

I THANK you heartily in the name of the Mission from America for your hospitable and flattering reception. I thank you for your kind references to the President of the United States and to that free democracy of America which we represent to the democracy of Russia. You say, Mr. Mayor, that Russia is ill and infirm. I have heard from many lips since reaching Russia expressions of anxiety and despondency for the fate of the new democracy, but I refuse to believe them. Russia is not infirm; Russia is young in her democracy, and with sincerity of purpose is groping to find the right way, that she may do the right thing.

We in the United States of America have faith in Russia, and as the representatives of our country, we carry with us that faith in Russia firm and unchanged. Let me tell you why we have faith in you. First; because we know that you have practiced the art of local self-government, through such institutions as this Duma, with success and fidelity to justice and with distinguished honor to your country. That is the true basis of national self-government; practice in local self-government. And so, although you have been deprived of the opportunity for national self-government, deprived of the opportunity to apply your ideas of democratic free self-government in the nation as a whole, nevertheless you will find the way to expand your experience in local self-government until it is adapted to the great task of guiding and governing the entire nation. You who have respected your own customs and local laws, and by the force of your local public opinion have enforced them, will establish national

laws, and by the union of all the cities and sections of Russia in a universal public opinion, you will give respect to the law of the nation and will enforce it. That is the true method of self-government; not to receive it from above by constitutions, however skillfully prepared; by theories, however brilliant; but to build it up from below by individual self-government; by habits of respect for law, and by a healthy public opinion.

The second reason why we have confidence in your success is that we know the kindly heart of the Russian people, the common sense of the Russian people, the innate respect for the rights of others that dwells in the Russian people. The members of our Mission, sir, have frequently spoken to each other of the marvelous spectacle we have witnessed since we landed upon the shores of Russia several weeks ago, of this vast people practically without any enforcement of law, practically without policemen to compel observance of the rights of others, yet in the main, with few exceptions, remaining peaceable, orderly, respecting each other's rights, considerate of each other's feelings and interests, and waiting only for the construction of a government under which their extraordinary qualities of self-control can make a firm and perpetual structure of law and order. You will make mistakes; you will have to retrace your steps here and there; you will find imperfections, but you will step by step go on to develop a structure of competent and successful free self-government. I speak with confidence because I know how many mistakes we have made in America during the one hundred and forty years through which we have been developing our free self-government; and to us who know how hard the task is, how many mistakes we have made, it is not a wonder that you have not made greater progress in the three months of your freedom, but it is a wonder that you have done so well.

A third reason why we have faith in you is because we know the capacity of the Russian character for self-sacrifice for an ideal. Many Russians have given up their lives in years past; many Russians have lingered in prison; many Russians have suffered hardship, in order that Russia might sometime be free; and we know it cannot be possible that Russians now are unwilling to make further sacrifices that Russia may remain free. We know that Russia cannot fail to value the prize that has been won at so high a price of suffering and of death. We know you must love liberty. We know that Russia cannot be materialistic, wedded to ease and comfort, indifferent to the higher good of her people, indifferent to the ideals of liberty which are to make over the world and lift up the poor and the oppressed who labor and suffer in many lands, to a heritage of opportunity and freedom. We know you cannot fail to love liberty when it has been bought at such a price as Russians have paid for it. We know that hundreds of thousands of Russians have given up their lives fighting for the Czar, and we do not for a moment believe that Russians now will not be willing to risk their lives fighting for Russia and Russia's freedom. That is the test of a people's power to maintain liberty; that they are willing to make sacrifices for liberty. No people can have liberty without paying the price. There is an old saying, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." More than that, it is an eternal truth that constant struggle is the price of liberty. And we are sure that Russia will not give over the struggle until her liberty is secure. We know that in the Russian heart there are cherished ideals that are far above the material, gross, daily needs of life. We know that Russia, free, with high ideals, with courage unsurpassed, jealous of her liberty, will never begin the career of the new democracy by being false to the ideals of liberty in the world.

There is another and broader reason for our faith. It is a reason that has grown with our people in America from the days of their early struggles against cold, hunger, and savage foes; through all the trials by which they have won and maintained their freedom; it is that we have faith in the triumph and perpetuity of Russian freedom, because we have an abiding faith in the power of democracy. You are not alone. You do not walk alone upon the pathway of self-government. One of those great movements of the human mind that no man can control or measure is taking place throughout the whole world. The conception of government solely by command of a superior power is fading from the minds of men throughout the world; and the new conception of government by the will of the governed, imposing the limitations of justice and right conduct upon themselves, is taking its place the world over. Yesterday was the day of emperors and kings; today is the day of the plain and humble man who works and endures. The progress of that majestic movement of mankind, that great development of civilization, cannot be turned back. It may be retarded here and there; it may be held for the moment by an obstacle here and an obstacle there; but that irresistible progress of mankind cannot be turned back in Russia, in America, anywhere on earth. It must and will proceed to work out its final fruition. No man can measure the time or the place where that fruition shall be reached. You are not alone; your history in Russia during the last two months is but one chapter in the great history of the advance of the human race along the pathway to this higher civilization which comes with freedom and universal opportunity and enlightenment.

The one obstacle that holds that progress for the moment, and only for the moment, is the sinister power of the military autocracy of Germany. That power which repudiates the faiths of treaties; that power which avows its

purpose to violate the laws of nations whenever it finds it to its interest to do so; that power which has erected among the peaceable people of the earth a vast military machine against which no unorganized peaceable people can stand; that power which avows that no moral laws control the state, but that the morality which you and I acknowledge as obligatory upon us in our relations to each other, has no control of the state, and that the supposed interest of the state is superior to all moral law; that power which has revived amid the civilization of the twentieth century all the worst of a dreadful, barbaric past and has enthroned and is endeavoring to enforce upon the world principles of conduct which, in cynical disregard of humanity and law and faith and morality, which in brutality and selfishness, have not been seen in this world since the fall of the Roman Empire. That power stands now as the one bulwark of the dark powers of the past against the triumphant advance of the light of a better day for mankind. No peaceful democracy can live beside it. America feels in its heart that it cannot live in its peaceful security by the side of the German military autocracy, and be safe. America feels that the new freedom of Russia cannot live as a neighbor to the military autocracy of Germany, because there is no middle ground between defense by military power, and subjection. Our faith in your working out a system of free self-government, adapted to the conditions and the character and the genius of the Russian people, is marred by but one doubt; and that is the doubt whether you will be able to protect the right to develop your own free government against the malign and sinister control of German autocracy. And it is because we know that your young liberty cannot live beside German power, and our own liberty cannot live beside German power, and freedom all over the world cannot live beside German power, that we have come to say to you that we have entered this war in the

service of freedom for you as well as for ourselves; to fight with you; to give our blood and treasure with you for the perpetuation of liberty in the world, Russian and American. We will stay with you to the end in that conflict, certain of its triumphant success; and we will stand with you, our old flag with its stars and stripes floating beside your new flag of Russian freedom, in the triumph of liberty over autocracy. Until that time comes, our labors, our blood, our treasure, our brotherly affection and our prayers are with you in your work.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE WAR INDUSTRIES
COMMITTEE AT MOSCOW, JUNE 23, 1917

IT is a great pleasure for me and for my associates in the Mission to be received by this Committee, because we have learned in America to appreciate very highly the extraordinary work that you have already done in your country. I do not think that we have fully appreciated, however, the difficulties under which you have labored. A study of the conditions in Russia since our arrival reveals those difficulties to be far greater than we had supposed. That increases our admiration for the courage, the persistency, and the public spirit with which you have carried on the great work of the last three years. I observe with some distress that there are influences operating now, attempting to influence the industrial conditions in Russia, which would tend to destroy the success of your future efforts. Of course, if the revolution is now to proceed to the destruction of all industrial enterprise, that must end your work, and there are plainly some malign influences which desire to accomplish that result. I have, however, the greatest confidence in the sincerity of purpose and the strong determination of the Provisional Government at Petrograd to combat and counteract these influences and to maintain the industrial system of the country. It is so plainly indicated by the conditions that the way to maintain industrial efficiency and continue the work of your committee is to stand by and support the authority of the Provisional Government, that I cannot doubt that such support will be freely and continuously given. A very cheering incident — more than an incident — a step in the progress of the revolution, is

the action recently taken in Petrograd by the General Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates. I refer to the resolution of that General Council of representatives from all Russia, welcoming the association and coöperation of capital and labor, of industrial enterprise and the proletariat. It may well be treated as the basis for the future development of your constitutional government. That resolution of that Council contrasts so sharply with the incitement of the sinister influences that are attempting to destroy the industrial life of Russia, that it may well be accepted as the authoritative declaration of the people of Russia, so far as they have yet been able to secure a representative assembly, in favor of the preservation of industrial life and enterprise.

Let me say a word about our work in America along your lines. Of course, we are quite new to war in America. We have had only little wars, and the idea of a whole nation mobilizing its industries for the support of a great army is quite new to us; but the people of the country are so thoroughly convinced that it is necessary for them to defend their liberty, that they cannot remain free and independent in the same world with a predominant militaristic autoocracy such as exists in Germany, that they are gladly yielding themselves to the constraint and sacrifices of the new system. We have had a little army. It had been supplied by ordinary purchases in the market, and by very few and small government manufacturing establishments. But now we have enrolled for military service ten million men between the ages of twenty and thirty. We have the few officers of our regular army now engaged in training some forty or fifty thousand men for new officers for commissions in the larger army. We have ordered a corps of five hundred thousand men from those enrolled to come out just as soon as these forty to fifty thousand officers now being trained will be ready to train the men. In the meantime, we shall go on

training another set of officers to train another set of men, and we shall continue that as long as it is necessary. In the meantime we are sending an advance division to the line in France and Belgium, and our men-of-war are now in European waters chasing U-boats.

Behind this provision we are mobilizing the industries of the country. All the railroads — I think over 250,000 miles — are put under the direction of the Government, — the first time in our history that this has ever been done. All the manufacturing establishments, makers of munitions and supplies of all kinds, and of the raw materials from which munitions and supplies are made, are put under the direction of the Government, and the Government is authorized to require them to produce the necessary supplies at prices which shall not yield any profit in excess of the profit fixed by the President as fair and reasonable. The food production and distribution are put under the direction of a new department of food production and supply, and for the direction of that we are utilizing the services of Mr. Hoover, who was at the head of the Belgian Relief. In the meantime also, the Government is putting itself directly behind and in support of the work of the Red Cross, which has hitherto been supported solely by voluntary contributions. Very great increases are being made in the contributions for the support of the Young Men's Christian Association work, which has been so extensive on the French line and on the British line in France and Belgium, and until the break with us, also on the Austrian line, and it has also begun on the Italian line. So that the services of that organization for the entertainment, the comfort and the instruction of the soldiers in their camps and immediately behind their trenches, may go forward on a larger scale than ever before.

Our friends in England and France and Italy have been very kind to us in sending over in various commissions,

gentlemen who have had great experience in war industries in their own countries; and we hope to profit by the mistakes which they tell us they have made and which I am told you have made; and profiting by these warnings, we are going to try not to withdraw from the industries of the country, for the purpose of the fighting-line, the men who are necessary to carry on the industries. So we are going to do our best and we are going to keep on doing it. I am happy to say that in the industrial situation in America, American labor is satisfied with the conditions, and its opportunity under the protection of law to develop its increasing prosperity by evolution. No part of our people have been more cheerful, loyal, and earnest in giving support to this whole system both of raising and maintaining an army and of industrial mobilization for its support, than the laboring men. We have the eight-hour law under national statutes, but the labor people of America cheerfully and with alacrity have assented to putting into the President's hands the right to suspend the operation of that eight-hour law and to call for labor during much longer hours and under more severe conditions, because of the immense public necessity of pressing forward the work in every direction.

Mr. Duncan, one of our Mission, who is one of the vice-presidents of the American Federation of Labor, assents very heartily to the statement I have just made about the attitude of our laboring people. I wish that the laboring men in Russia might become fully acquainted with the way in which the laboring people in the United States, after long experience in maintaining their own rights, look at their relations to the Government and the need of the country at this time.

Now I have talked to you too much about ourselves, but it is sometimes encouraging when one is at work very hard and very earnestly, to feel that there are others in sympathy,

engaged in similar work and pressing forward in the same direction. I have said so much, in order that you may feel that you have not merely the sympathy of rhetoric, but the sympathy of workers in the same cause. I want to have you feel that you are not alone, but that in America the good men, the loyal men, the men who really desire better things for their country, who wish that their people shall be free, are earnestly doing the same kind of work that you are doing for Russia. You have our most earnest sympathy for the future of your great undertakings.

[There followed several addresses in Russian and in French, after which Mr. Root said]:

Let me say a word regarding your references to the supply of locomotives and cars. The first thing this Mission did after its appointment and before leaving Washington, was to recommend to our Government that it put itself behind the order which the Russian Government was then ready to place, for 500 locomotives and 10,000 freight cars, and that was done, the Government making a credit of \$100,000,000 and arranging with the manufacturers to expedite the filling of that order. There were already prior orders for 375 locomotives and about 10,000 freight cars, which are now in process of being filled. I suppose the first installment has been delivered by this time; if not, it is no doubt upon the ocean, and the manufacturers are ready to go on with deliveries under the old order.

The new order, which was made just before we left, for 500 locomotives and 10,000 cars, will come on right after those deliveries. It is the view of this Mission that that process should be continued, our Government making credits and expediting manufacture for still further orders; but the limit of the possibility of supply is not money, not capacity for production; it is shipping. The supply of locomotives is going on now and will continue to go on to the full extent

of the possibility of shipment across the ocean. We have begun to build ships in order to take the place of those destroyed by the submarine warfare. It takes time, as you know, to enlarge greatly manufacture in any industry, but we hope before very long to make very material additions to the shipping of the world, so that we expect to increase the supply of rolling stock for your railroads.

I will add also that investigation has shown both to the American experts who were invited here and to their Russian associates, in recent inquiries into railroad administration, that very great increase in efficiency of transportation can be brought about by some changes in organization. You can come very near doubling the efficiency of the rolling stock you have in this country now, and I hope that will be accomplished.

Of course, when any industry, whether it be transportation, or manufacture or distribution, is organized for one set of conditions and then new and more onerous conditions must be dealt with, you have got to change your organization to meet the new conditions.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE ZEMSTVO UNION, AT
MOSCOW, JUNE 23, 1917

I THANK you very much for permitting the Mission from America, for which I have the honor to speak, to visit you and to look into your faces, and to listen to the account of the great work in which you are engaged. We feel that here there is something more than oratory; there is service, and that is the real thing. Your work has not been unknown to us in America. One of the chief grounds for confidence in the newly formed revolutionary government was the presence at its head of Prince Lvoff, who so long and so ably directed the affairs of your union. We feel that you are not merely engaged in the necessary work of supplying the Russian army, but that you are exhibiting to the world the highest evidence that Russia is a living force, worthy of freedom. For in these two respects you show that you are building up self-government upon solid foundations. Liberty is a natural right to which all men may aspire, but self-government is an art which must be acquired. Liberty without the capacity for self-government is a fatal gift. Now, you base your work upon individual enterprise and local association organized and united for a natural purpose. This is the way that self-government is built up so that it can endure. This is the way in which the self-government which preserves and maintains our liberty and justice in America was built up.

People wonder how the old bureaucracy was cast off so easily and suddenly. I think I begin to see that it was because underneath that cover which sought to repress the Russian people, the Russian people were growing in capacity for freedom. It is your work which is the true avenue and method

of the growth of the people. The other respect in which I say that your work is of the highest importance, and is the highest evidence of the fitness of Russia for freedom, is that without arguing or reasoning about it, you are illustrating the true principle necessary for the maintenance of freedom; and that principle is the principle of service. One always loves another for whom he has to care. If a people are to love their country and be willing to maintain its freedom, they must serve their country. The principle of free self-government is the principle not what I can get out of the country, but what can I give to the country. The bureaucratic government which you have cast aside, was composed largely of men who only thought of what they could get out of the country. You have brought into the life of Russia a great service, people who are seeking to know what they can give to their country. And so I have abiding faith that the government which is being built upon such foundations, will accord with the character, the life and the genius of the Russian people. I believe that you have not only been serving your soldiers at the front, but you have been laying foundations for your liberty — the liberty of the Russian people; the foundations upon which will be built the great structure of Russian liberty in the future, — that structure which will stand for many centuries to come.

And so, we all feel honored and proud to meet you and to hail you as friends in the great work of liberty and justice the world over. If America can help you in your work tell us what to do and we shall be glad to do it; for while peoples are many, separated by oceans and continents, liberty is one, the laws of justice and humanity are one code the world over; and for the maintenance of these laws we should all struggle together, as brothers and sisters of humanity.

ADDRESS AT THE MOSCOW PEOPLE'S BANK,
MOSCOW, JUNE 23, 1917

I THANK you very much in behalf of the whole Mission from the United States for your very kind and hospitable welcome. This institution has been the object of very great interest in the United States. We have long felt that our banking system was defective. We had banks which were adapted to commercial uses, affording opportunities for the commercial and manufacturing people, and we had a great system of very strong and well conducted savings banks for the deposit of the savings of people of small means; but we had no agency through which the ordinary agricultural industry of the country could be accommodated. We have for a number of years felt that the proper development of our agriculture was limited by the absence of some such institution. Accordingly we have studied your work and your institution, and we are full of admiration for it and for the Russian people who have been able to organize it and to maintain it. We hope to learn from it, we are learning much from it in the effort we are now making to establish agricultural loan banks throughout our country for the benefit of the agricultural producers of the country. It is a very great pleasure and honor for us to be received by you and to listen to these explanations of your institution, and we thank you sincerely.

We join with you in the determination that the national system of development, of finance and industry, of the modes by which the people may develop their own prosperity, shall not be taken away by Germany, either by force or by fraud. We feel with you that, unless resisted, the imposition of the

German control upon our country would result in having what may be a very efficient system but still German and not ours; and we feel sure that the result of such domination would be that we should become a subject nation to the German power, and we do not mean that that shall ever happen!

ADDRESS AT THE MEETING OF THE BOURSE
OF MOSCOW, JUNE 23, 1917

THE Mission from the United States, for which I speak, appreciates very highly the hospitality and the friendship with which you have received us here; and we thank you for being so good as to come together for the purpose of meeting us.

This Mission has no concern with commerce or industry or profit. The instincts of the American democracy were that the vital point upon which all commerce, all industry, all profit in the future, and liberty itself depends, is the prevention of the domination of the military autoocracy of Germany in the free and of necessity less completely organized democracies of the world. The function of this Mission was intentionally limited especially to alliance and coöperation in the conduct of the war against Germany. We wished that no one should be able to say or to think that this Mission had come here to secure advantage or profit for America in trade or in industry. To our minds the domination of Germany is like a gas attack. When that poison gas rolls over the country nobody can breathe except a German, and we propose to join hands — to join hands with Russia — to destroy the machine that makes the gas. When that is done, when Russia has an opportunity freely to develop her system of government in accordance with the customs and genius of the Russian people, then will be laid the foundation for enterprise and industry, for great undertakings in the development of your vast natural wealth, and for the free intercourse of trade between you and the rest of the world, in which, we all hope, mutual friendship and labor together in a

common cause will include the people of the United States of America.

You are now experiencing the feeling of uncertainty. Certainty after all, is at the basis of your occupation. It is at the basis of all trade; at the basis of all financial development; at the basis of all successful enterprise. Certainty; certainty of protection by government and certainty of protection against government. Various of the older countries have had various ways of securing that certainty. By certainty, I mean that when money is invested in an enterprise, in a mine, in a farm, or in a manufactory, the people who are concerned in it, or who are invited to purchase an interest in it, may know that there is a government that will protect them in the exercise of the right to conduct that enterprise; and will not take it away as soon as it becomes profitable. Upon that the prosperity of every bourse in the world, and the prosperity of all enterprise for the development of all the wealth of all the countries in the world, depends; upon that security all these things must rest. In some old countries the natural conservatism of the people furnishes the security; that is so in England; it is so in France, and I judge that to some extent it is so in Russia. I say to some extent, because you are so new to free government here, and there appear to be conflicting ideas in some quarters. In the United States, being a new country, and not having long-established customs of many centuries to furnish this security, we undertook to create it by putting into our written Constitution certain rules of conduct which were binding upon the Government; that no man shall be deprived of his life, or liberty, or property except by due process of law; that private property shall not be taken for public use without compensation; that no law shall be passed impairing the obligation of contracts, and other similar rules; and by this Constitution we limit the powers of all officers of government, so that they have no official

power to violate any of these rules. If any public officer undertakes to take away my property, or to prevent my just use of it, he is a trespasser, and I can prosecute him by law and make him pay damages or punish him for violation of my rights, and he is not protected by his official character. No public officer, no president or governor, or executive officer of any kind, no congress or legislature, or state or local body can overrule the judgments of the courts protecting all citizens in the possession of their private property and the exercise of their rights to use it. Accordingly, when the securities of any enterprise are offered for sale, in the American stock exchange, everybody knows that if he buys them he will get an interest in the property that cannot be taken away from him. The property may be good or bad, the enterprise may succeed or fail; the purchaser takes those chances, but one chance he does not have to take; he runs no risk of the property being taken away from the corporation or association that proposes to carry it on, and no risk that that association will be prevented from working out the enterprise and securing its fruits.

We shall look with the greatest interest to the work of your coming Constituent Convention to see how far you find it desirable, or find yourselves able to include guarantees and safeguards, against destroying the fundamental basis of enterprise, upon which your prosperity and the development of the wealth of Russia must depend. And to that effort, and to all your efforts for the establishment of a new and adequate political system, and for placing your industrial, and commercial system upon a sound and broader and more secure foundation, for ensuring the political, industrial, and economic freedom of Russia, and for keeping out from control over your lives, the domination, either military or political or financial, of the brutal and arrogant power of Germany, the sympathy and good wishes and hearty coöperation of the people of the United States will ever be extended.

ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY GENERAL BRUSILOFF AT GENERAL STAFF HEAD- QUARTERS, "STAFKA," JUNE 27, 1917

On June 27, 1917, the Russian general, Alexis Brusiloff, gave a luncheon at general staff headquarters, in Mogileve, in honor of the American Diplomatic Mission. After the luncheon, General Brusiloff welcomed the Mission in the following address:

Mr. AMBASSADOR, I am glad that I have the honor to welcome you as representative of our new great ally.

Russia and America, — these are two worlds divided by oceans; but it is my wish that you who have conquered distances and have come as our dear and welcome guests shall gain the impression that your beautiful country is not distant, but close to Russia. Here, as across the ocean, you will find the same banner bearing the same great device, — liberty, civil, social, political, and national. America, which has long ago acquired the former, has now declared herself for the latter; as, without the independence and liberty of nations, all others are mere visions. Having just passed through changes such as history has seldom known, we are now deeply satisfied, feeling that our glorious allies are strengthened by a new and powerful support — the great transatlantic republic. Continuing the war with all the powers at our disposal, we shall fight not only for our own cause, fortifying the liberty we have recently acquired, but at the same time — hand in hand with you — we shall fight for the right of all nations to shape their destinies in accordance with their own desires.

With deep faith in our common and just cause, allow me, in the name of the Russian army, to welcome our great democratic ally and its glorious army, and also you gentlemen whom we are glad to welcome to our fraternal military circle.

RESPONSE OF MR. ROOT

I THANK you sincerely for your courteous and friendly greeting and for the kind things you have said about my country. It is most encouraging for America, which has entered the great war to be the friend and ally of the new democracy of Russia, to know that in the warfare in our common cause against the hateful autocracy of Germany, we will still have the advantage of your military genius, which the world esteems so well; and will still

have the benefit of that bulwark of liberty which the dauntless courage and fortitude of the soldiers of Russia are able to maintain against the aggressions of military autocracy.

We are peaceful people in America, but we have learned that we cannot continue a free people unless we prevent the supremacy of autocratic German power in the world. We have no hatred towards Germany, but we will not be subjugated by her, nor ruled by her. We have learned that her professions of friendship are false. For a long time, when we objected to Germany's murder of our innocent people, men and women and children, upon the high seas through her submarine warfare, Germany put us off with friendly words, and specious promises, and professions of desire to observe our interests. At last we learned by her own confession that she was but keeping us quiet in order that she might have time to build more submarine boats to murder our citizens more readily; just as Germany sends her troops to fraternize with the kindly Russians upon your front, and while protesting friendship there, she is at the same time murdering the Russian soldiers in German prison camps by cruel and inhuman treatment.

We are glad that you know the truth regarding this foe of liberty and honor; we are glad that you know that no faith and no morality and no humanity is to be found in the class that rules Germany; we are glad that you have learned, as we have learned, that if we are to maintain our liberty in Russia and in America, we must be able to make sacrifices for it, to fight for it, and if need be to die for it, in order that our beloved countries may live in freedom and not be subjected to a foreign power. And as brothers in that cause, the greatest that the world has ever seen; in behalf of the whole people of the United States, I give you the toast: To the indomitable Russian Army and to its heroic Commander-in-Chief, to whom be honor and success and glory to the end!

ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
PETROGRAD, JULY 4, 1917

I AM sure I speak not only for myself and the other members of the Diplomatic Mission from the United States, but also for the ambassador of the United States to Russia and these gentlemen who have come as an advisory commission to endeavor to help in the transportation problems of Russia — I speak for them all in returning most hearty thanks both for the expressions which have been used today and for the substantial and real feeling we have found behind the expression. We have met in Russia everywhere the most kindly and hospitable reception. We have been met with the utmost frankness and sincerity and helpfulness. Everywhere in the government and among the many citizens of Russia with whom we have been brought into contact this has been true. We are deeply grateful for all that you have done for us, and for the spirit you have exhibited; and we shall go back to the United States to carry a report of all possible evidence of real friendship, real coöperation, real union, in a common spirit, between the two great democracies.

As we of the Diplomatic Mission are about to depart from Russia upon the coming Monday, I wish to say that we leave Russia with cheerful hope and confidence for the successful accomplishment of the great task which the people of Russia have undertaken. We leave with renewed faith in your competency, in all branches of your government and in all sections and grades of your people, to do the great work which you undertook when you dethroned your czar. And we base our confidence on substantial grounds — not upon patriotic words, not upon the expression of theories; not upon noble

sentiments alone, but upon what we find in the character of the Russian people — upon the real and extraordinary progress which the Russian people have made in organization under the most unfavorable circumstances — the organization of local self-government followed by the organization of local governments into great unions, with national scope and purpose, which have been so efficient in making possible a strong support of the Russian armies in the field during the war. And it is a knowledge of that great work which makes the presence of Prince Lvoff as president of the Provisional Government a source of satisfaction, and of confidence for the future.

We base our opinion also upon the evidences of capacity for individual enterprise which we have found in Russia — the capacity to inaugurate and carry on great enterprises by private initiative and independently of the government; and we base it still further upon the self-control, the essential kindness, the tendency toward order and peaceful relations among the men in all Russian communities. These are the qualities which are the most essential for free government. All of those qualities which have wrecked attempts at self-government in the past because passion became supreme, seem to be absent from Russian character, and those qualities which have made permanent self-government by the people, seem to be in a high degree developed in Russian character. So we have faith in you. We shall go back and carry a message of confidence in the future of Russia and a message of cheer to our country, because we have no idea of a fleeting friendship, but a certainty of a permanent and persistent and effective ally in Russia, in the great war upon which we have so recently entered.

You so very kindly referred to the day which the people of the United States all celebrate. That day was marked by the American Declaration of Independence which framed the

issue in what was really civil war between two groups of the people of Great Britain. With many adherents upon both sides in the American colonies and in England, that war completely established not merely for the American colonies but for Great Britain, upon a broader and surer foundation, the principles of English freedom; and Sir George Buchanan and I look with kindly eyes at one another across this table, enjoying the inheritance of that same great principle of individual freedom which triumphed in what we know as the American Revolution. That principle is at stake again in the world today. Because it is at stake again, the grandchildren and great grandchildren of those who fought in the American Revolution are joining hands with each other for a new struggle to enthrone the principle of individual liberty and to cast down the principle of the divine right of one man to keep a people in servitude. The two principles cannot live together. The Declaration of Independence which marks this day sets up the principle of freedom in these words:

That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That is the principle of democracy. That is opposed to the existence of a divine right to govern others. Governments are instituted to secure the unalienable rights of all men and of every man. The other principle — the principle of autocracy is diametrically and eternally opposed to the principle of democracy. The two principles cannot live together. The conflict between them is inevitable and eternal. One or the other must conquer. We must be either all free or all slaves; and it is in defense of that great and necessary principle of human liberty that the people of the United States abandon

their security, with no enemy at their doors, with no one inflicting injury upon their smiling fields nor on their rich towns. It is in support of that principle necessary to human liberty that the people of the United States come to fight, to shed their blood and their treasure in the war which they hate as a peace-loving people, in order that our children may all live in peace and in justice and that the hateful principle of evil that has come down from a dark and cruel past may no longer oppress the earth, but may pass away and the new order of things may come. No one can tell what the issue of today or tomorrow may be! No one can tell what sacrifice and suffering stand between, but the ultimate supremacy of the principle of human freedom is as certain as the sunrise tomorrow. It cannot be turned back. It may be retarded here or there for the moment, but with the great movement of the human race, the conception of a sovereign power as necessary to the maintenance of order, is passing away, and the conception of great free peoples governing and maintaining order by the laws that they impose upon themselves is taking its place; and the majestic progress of an enlightened world will go on and on to the necessary result of a triumphant democracy the world over.

God grant, my friends and all of our allies, that the day may come quickly and that the suffering and death — the agony — may soon end; but however long it may be, we must not permit human freedom to end — it is better to die than to be slaves.

ADDRESS AT A LUNCHEON OF THE AMERICAN
CLUB, PETROGRAD, JULY 6, 1917

I NEED not tell you, who have been so long away from your home, in a far distant land, how it warms the hearts of the members of this Diplomatic Mission to find themselves once more in the atmosphere of America and Americanism, and to hear the familiar intonations and sounds of that best of English which you have been speaking.

I think all of us received many messages from many friends to many of you, delivered almost daily in conversation, "give my kind regards to so and so"; "remember me to so and so"; "I hope you will meet so and so; he is a good fellow; a good American; knows what he is about"; or "he can tell you much about Russia"; too many to be delivered individually, but we combine all of these messages of friendship and old acquaintance in one message from America to you Americans, and the message is: that America is awake; awake to her old traditions; to her old ideals; there has come back to your country the spirit of the earlier days, and you need have no fear that you in this distant land will have to blush for your country.

You know what has been done; you know of the enrollment of ten million of the young men of America for military service; you know that forty thousand and more are being trained now in fourteen different camps throughout the country by the few officers of our regular army, to serve as officers in the greater American army of the near future; that five hundred thousand of the men enrolled are to be called up within a few weeks to be trained by these officers, who are now receiving their training, and that then the pro-

cess is to be repeated; more officers are then to be trained and when they are ready another five hundred thousand men are to be called up; that that process is to be repeated as often as it is necessary; you know that our ships are already in European waters acting in concert with the navies of our allies and protecting the ships of commerce upon the seas against the submarine attacks; you know that already engineer regiments are in France aiding in the preparation of the ways of communication, the railroads for the carrying of supplies from the bases to the front of the French and English lines; you know that General Pershing is already there making the arrangements for the bases and the lines of communication for the service of the advanced division which is to take its place under the Stars and Stripes in that line of terrific conflict; and you know that already the efficient men in every branch of commerce, of industry, of transportation, of manufacture, of production of all kinds, have been called to Washington and are directing in concert with the Government, the mobilization and massing of the entire industrial capacity of our country behind the army which is in course of formation. Never before has there been such unity of the brain, the feeling, and the determination of the American people as is exhibited now in our own country. You are far away from the scene of that great action. It is impossible for you to play a part in that; but you can yet serve your country, serve it most effectively and most beneficially.

Let me tell you that this Diplomatic Mission is returning full of admiration for what it has found in the character and the conduct of the Russian people. Many things go wrong; many things are done, which upon the surface appear to justify criticism; but I beg you to remember how many things in our own Government go wrong and appear to justify criticism. That is one of the essential, the necessary characteristics of a democracy in which individual freedom

is preserved, and is not sacrificed to that intense discipline which destroys self-government. I think it is wonderful that the Russian people have preserved the peace and order that reigns here in Russia. We hear of a disturbance in this place, in that place, in another place, but this is a vast empire which covers a sixth of the habitable globe, with a hundred and eighty million people, and when you withdraw your attention from some specific act of disorder, and consider how small a part incidents of that description play in the great life of a people, you must realize that as a whole, the self-control and consideration for right, for justice, for the rights of others, displayed in Russia during these past few months constitutes one of the wonders of the world. Searching for the reason, inquiring why it is that this city of Petrograd is so peaceful and orderly that a woman at any time of the day or night may pass through the streets with safety and without fear of molestation; why it is that all over this land order is preserved without the compulsion of law or the force of the policeman, under circumstances which we know very well would have developed widespread disorder and violence in our own country, I find it in certain essential and inherent qualities of Russian character:—the quality of kindly consideration for others; the capacity for united action, for systematic coöperation, for the attainment of specific ends; the capacity for organization in local self-government; and in the capacity for the organization of the agencies of local self-government into greater organizations with a national scope and purpose. These qualities furnish the test for the capacity of a people to govern itself. That is the question; not little surface matters; not little peanut politics (I do not know that Mr. Rodzianko will know what I mean by peanut politics, but you Americans know what peanut politics are). The question of whether a nation is to maintain its freedom depends upon the character of the

people, and if you want to know whether a people has hope for the future in self-government find out its character. There is no more fatal gift than the gift of freedom to a nation that is not ready for it, and there is nothing more certain than that a nation which is ready for freedom will maintain its freedom when it gets it.

Now I have said you can serve your country here. You can serve it by being true to the spirit of the American democracy here. How did we win and how have we maintained our liberty with peace and order? Not by our prosperity; not by amassing wealth; not by building palaces; not by our two hundred and fifty thousand miles of railroad; we have maintained it by having stout hearts; by having faith in democracy; in the competency and power of the American democracy to meet the demands upon it and to solve its problems and to win its fights. It was so that our republic was built. Our fathers suffered, and endured, and sacrificed, and in the darkest days their hearts never failed. We have seen darker times than Russia sees now. We have seen times when the American dollar was worth less in proportion to gold than the Russian rouble is worth now; we have seen times when American finance seemed more desperate than Russian finance is today; we have seen the time when dissension, disorder, and controversy among our people seemed to be more bitter than any dissension or controversy among the Russian people seem to be now. You can serve your country by representing in every office and every home in Petrograd and in Russia to which an American comes, that spirit of American democracy here in Russia. Make it plain to all; carry the light of triumphant, and courageous and unflinching democracy, and faith in the capacity of a free people to maintain their freedom in every part. This great war has reached a point where the question of victory or defeat is not so much a question of military preparation;

is not so much a question of numbers of men, or of guns, as it is a question of who have the stoutest hearts; who will faint first; who will give up first; who will lose faith first.

You can help our friends and allies in Russia by being — you one hundred Americans here — each one, the center of influence more potent than high explosives; of influence making for courage, and hope, and intrepidity, and undying persistency in the maintenance of freedom against the German autocracy. You can help to put courage into all Russia; help to cheer the despondent; help to maintain this government which is now carrying Russia through the doubtful and difficult period before the Constituent Assembly shall have established a permanent government and the people begin to make laws for themselves. This is the mission of all of you; more important than that of this Diplomatic Mission which has come from America. You are all of you envoys of your country, and you can help to maintain this great alliance and support the armies of your own country when they get into the field, by the power of your faith, which can move mountains, exhibited in your own proper persons, in your intercourse with your associates and your friends in Russia. More than that, by your faith and its manifestations, by your appreciation of the qualities that make for self-government in Russia, by your faith in the Russian democracy, you can illustrate and bring honor to your people and to the spirit of the American democracy. You can make it known throughout this great country that in America, Americans believe in the competency of the people to rule; believe in the competency of the Russian people to rule themselves and to maintain their freedom. You can have it understood in Russia that the motive which most moves America is not the success of your own business, is not the making of money, the promotion of commerce, but that it is loyalty, not only throughout America, but in Russia, and the whole world, to

the high ideals of our fathers, the high ideals of the American Republic, for the lifting up of the great mass of toiling and enduring men throughout the world to freedom and opportunity and peace and justice. Then, indeed, America will be honored and beloved here and everywhere in the civilized world.

ADDRESS AT A MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF
LIQUIDATION OF THE AFFAIRS OF POLAND
PETROGRAD, JULY 7, 1917

IN behalf of all of my associates on the Diplomatic Mission which is now about concluding its visit to Russia, I thank you, both for the kindly greeting with which you have received us, for your courtesy and friendship, and for the appropriate and appreciative words in which you have described the character of our country and the character of that President who is now in the forefront of the great battle for human liberty.

There are many reasons why representatives of the free people of the United States should be most appreciative of this greeting from the men of Poland. It is not merely that as children we were taught to revere and honor the names of Kosciusko and Pulaski who, with others, many others, of the same blood, aided us one hundred and forty years ago in the hard struggle of the impoverished colonies of America to achieve their liberty; it is not alone that hundreds of thousands of Poles have sought opportunity and liberty in our free country, and by their industry, their probity, their good citizenship, and their high character, have elevated our conception of the character and genius of Poland. It is also because as lovers of liberty, Poles have worked with the forces of civilization to advance all that is noblest and best in humanity, that we look back with reverence and with joy to the great examples that Poland has given to the world. It is what you have done for us, — because your citizens are with us, and because of what you have done for humanity, that we are proud to be honored by you now.

You know that the people of the United States have lately taken the hard decision to enter the great world war. It was difficult for us to do it, because we are a peaceful people. No one had invaded our country; no one appeared to be taking away our liberty; but we came, step by step, as we watched the process of this great struggle, to realize that it was not merely the interests of the Allies in Europe that were at stake, but that the liberty of mankind was at stake, — your liberty and ours equally, and so, still preserving in the midst of our wealth, prosperity and ease, those great ideals that made America free, we determined that it was our duty to be ready to sacrifice treasure and life, in order that the world might live free from oppression.

We are with you to fight for our freedom; happy to fight also for the freedom of that great nation which has given to us so much of genius; which has given to the world philosophers and sages, poets and musicians; which has been the admiration of mankind, but has for so long mourned for its own home and been an outcast from its roof-tree and its ancient abiding place. We are happy that we can fight with you, while you seek to secure again your birthright, and to take again your place among the nations of the world which you so well deserve.

The policy of the Government of the United States has been not to permit any divisions in its military forces. It was determined that we would not allow even the division which would necessarily accompany military organizations upon national or racial lines, to interfere with the efficiency of our forces. We are raising a great army of Americans which will include Poles and Scandinavians and Irish and French and Italians and English, and the people of every blood on the face of the earth, all in one firmly knitted and united army, that its efficiency may be the greatest possible. But for that **I am sure you would find great Polish legions organizing in**

America. But I am sure that the world will see many thousands of Poles coming from the citizenship of the United States, fighting under our Stars and Stripes, happy to meet danger and glad to die, if need be, for the liberty of their adopted country, and for the liberty of their fatherland.

Union and strength, — all united without division or distinction, — is the watchword under which we may best accomplish the great result we all seek. Our way is clear. No doubt need beset us or make our steps to falter. We know, all of us know, that liberty is impossible, either for us or others, in the neighborhood of the military autocracy of Germany. We know, all of us know, that no Poland can arise again from the ashes of the past if that military autocracy is dominant in Europe; and our pathway is clear. Germany must be defeated, and Poles and Americans alike will do their duty to accomplish this great defeat. Ah! happy men, happy men whose lot has fallen in this great era! Happy men who, after all these long years, after these many generations of helplessness and despair, at last, at last, find it in your lives to make your sacrifices for the liberty of Poland. Ah! God is good to you, God is good to you that you live now, not in the dark and hopeless days of the past and not in the future, where our children will only have to look back to the great deeds which will set the name and the fame and military genius of Poland again on the pedestal, as high as that on which Poland stood when it rescued Christendom from the hordes of the Moslem invader. My congratulations to you all. America congratulates you all, and America will be proud upon that great day when a renewed Poland shall take its place among the free self-governments of the world by the side of free democratic America.

ADDRESS BEFORE A LARGE BODY OF RUSSIAN SOLDIERS AT PERM, JULY 13, 1917

MY companions and I are a Mission from the democratic republic of America to the Russian people. We came across the sea to Russia to say to the Russian people that Americans are their friends, and have gone into this great war to fight with Russians for the liberty of Russia and of America against the overbearing and oppressive military autocracy of Germany. When we came we were alarmed by the confusion which had followed your glorious revolution. You had gained your freedom; you had cast off the discipline of the superior powers of the bureaucratic government that oppressed you; you had not yet gained that new discipline, that new capacity to work together for a common object, which comes with the training and experience of free self-government. There was confusion; there was lack of that discipline which is necessary to enable an army to fight successfully and to win victories over its enemy. But, God be praised, you are now acquiring that discipline and capacity to work together for victory over your enemy. God sent a great man to be your leader in Kerensky, and under his leadership, under his appeals to the soldiers at the front, discipline has been restored. And under that great general, whose fame will live forever, Brusiloff, under the lead of Brusiloff at the front, the soldiers of Russia on the 18th of June marched again against the German foe; and on the 18th of June the Russian army advanced with perfect discipline, with perfect enthusiasm, with perfect courage, and won another victory, as glorious as any ever won by Russian arms, because it was a victory over

the forces that were tending to destroy Russian discipline, and a victory over the enemy as well. That discipline, that spirit, that capacity to fight together against the enemy, has appeared throughout the entire front from Riga to the Caucasus and Persia. When you reach the front you will come to an army that is inspired by love for Russia; an army steadied by renewed confidence in its superior officers who are leading it to victory, and an army that is inspired by the determination to maintain the liberty you have won by your great revolution. Let me tell you that your liberty cannot be preserved unless you are willing to make sacrifices for it, to fight for it, to risk your lives for it. I tell you this because I come from a people who won their liberty one hundred and forty years ago and have been struggling to maintain it ever since. Your liberty which you have today will be taken from you unless you have the strength and the courage to maintain it. No one in this world, no nation, ever kept its liberty unless it had the strength and the courage and will to defend it. You are going to the front to fight with brave comrades, under great generals, for the greatest cause on earth; the liberty, the equality and the independent manhood of the one hundred and eighty million people of free Russia. As you fight, willing to die if need be, you are helping to hand down to your children and your children's children, the liberty that you have won and that you are preserving. As you go to the front, as you go into battle, we pray that God's blessings may go with you and keep you safe, and enable you to do the full service of free men for your free country.

ADDRESS BEFORE A GATHERING OF SOLDIERS AND CITIZENS AT NAZUVAESKAYA, JULY 14, 1917

UPON this train are the members of a Mission sent across the sea from America, half-way around the world, to bring a message of friendship and loyal comradeship to the democracy of Russia. In that distant land young men are gathering, as you are gathered, to fight for liberty, for American liberty and Russian liberty, against the common foe, the military autocracy of Germany; and they will fight, as you will fight to the end, until victory crowns the flag of freedom in the battle against oppression and autocracy. More than one hundred years ago on this great day the people of France, the plain people of France, began their wonderful fight for their liberty which they still maintain under the same flag under which they fought for it, to the sound of the same air that you have been playing here today, the Marseillaise. With their sufferings and sacrifices, with their blood, it was the people of France who taught you and taught us that those who deserve liberty must be willing to fight for it. You and we will still fight, side by side, with the men of France, for their liberty and ours, and you and we will continue the struggle until we know that our children will inherit our lands in freedom, subject to no autocrat, subject to no oppressive class; free men, each one his own master, the master of his own fate; until a great, free, and happy people shall govern themselves under the law of justice and of liberty. Our blessings go with you, young men of Russia, as you go to fight your country's battles, and the world's battles, for the noblest

cause that ever lifted up the head of man, and inspired him with deeds of valor and made him indifferent to death. To you we pledge the coöperation, the aid, the comradeship of the men, the young men, of free democratic America until the glorious day of victory.

ADDRESS AT A RECEPTION BY THE CITY OF
SEATTLE, AUGUST 4, 1917

THIS Diplomatic Mission which is now returning from its long and fatiguing journey to our new sister republic on the other side of the world is deeply grateful for this generous welcome back to our country.

It is our country, though each one of us is far from his own fireside. It is our country because on the Atlantic and the Pacific, in the Alleghenies and the Sierras, on the Mississippi and the Hudson and the Columbia, there prevail the same standard of independent manhood, the same love of justice, the same indomitable determination to be free, and the loyalty to the same ideals that have made America the greatest union for liberty and justice the world has ever seen. This is our country and it is our home and you, men and women of Seattle, are our brothers and our sisters in the great brotherhood of civilization, of humanity, of Christianity.

This is a diplomatic mission and it is not suitable that in advance of reporting to the Department of State, from which we have come, we should talk to you or to anybody about the special circumstances or conclusions of our Mission. But I cannot refrain from saying that we bring back from Russia a deep sympathy for the efforts of that young democracy which is struggling now month by month with the hard problems that we have taken one hundred and forty years to solve and have not yet solved. We bring back not only a deep sympathy, but a sincere admiration for the qualities of Russian character. We have found the Russians kindly, considerate of the rights and feelings of others, with a

high capacity for self-control, with an extraordinary ability for united action and with a noble idealism that leads always in the better way towards higher things; and we have an abiding faith that Russia, through trials and tribulations, indeed, which she cannot escape, will work out, create and make perpetual a great free, self-governing, democratic government.

In Russia, almost within the sound of the guns, I think we got a little nearer to the truth that lies in the great war upon which our country has just entered. I think we bring back a deeper realization of some things which it has been hard for the people of the United States to appreciate. We see now why it is that all the world is at war. We see that for centuries we have been building up a structure of civilization. We have fondly believed that the world was growing better, more humane, more just, more devoted to justice, more willing to permit our fellow-men to enjoy freedom. We have believed that the old dark days of cruelty and tyranny were passed away; and the nations of the earth year by year have entered into solemn covenants to observe more nearly those divine precepts under which we all profess to live. For that cause of the upward progress of humanity along the pathway of civilization to a true Christian life, our fathers fought and suffered. In that cause our American republic was born and struggled and agonized, and all that is best and truest in American nature was evolved in the course of its aid and in efforts towards advancing that cause of humanity and civilization.

We see now more clearly than ever before that a great military power, a great military autocracy, proceeding upon the principle, animated by the spirit, avowing the purpose of the dark and cruel past, has thrown down the gauntlet to the civilization and the liberty of our day. We see that Germany repudiates the rule of morality upon nations; that the con-

trol of law, the law of nations to which she has solemnly agreed, is cast aside the moment her interest conflicts with it; that the faith of treaties, the solemn, binding faith of treaties, that faith without which human society cannot endure except as a society of slaves subject to despotism, the faith of treaties is repudiated and held as naught. We see that all those rules which a kindly civilization has agreed upon in the past to ameliorate the horrors of war are cast aside with cynical indifference. We see that for the sake of ambition, of lust for military glory, laws are violated, treaties held as naught, peaceful nations are overrun, the rule of morality is repudiated, the laws of humanity are forgotten; burned homes and devastated lands, outraged women and murdered children, mark the pathway by which this reincarnation of cruelty and barbarism is marching to the domination of the world. We see now that the principles of good and evil, the principles of liberty and slavery, the principles of humanity and cruelty have locked horns in a conflict which cannot be downed. We see that the ideals of our fathers in this republic must go down to earth before the triumphant march of this German Moloch, or the men who are loyal to those ideals must muster their manhood in their support.

It is not a matter of sentiment, of something far away. As sure as the sun shall rise tomorrow, if this war ends with the triumph of Germany, this country will become a subject nation, for the principles and the temper of the German people — of the German ruling class I should say — ever reaching out for more power will turn, aye, it has turned its eyes toward the fertile fields, the vast wealth and the great unpeopled spaces of this rich and defenseless hemisphere. Leave your wealth on the sidewalk and trust that the passing thief will refrain from taking it; send your richly laden ships to sea and trust that the pirate will let them pass without interference, rather than let America remain rich beyond the

dreams of avarice and unwilling or incompetent to defend herself. Ah! We are none too soon in beginning our preparation for the preservation of our liberty. There will be sacrifices. Ah, yes! They will be bitter. There will be wounds and death. Some of us will die. There will be orphaned children and widowed homes. There will be straitened means, sacrifices of comfort. There will be discouragement and doubt and almost despair, but in the end there will be a great free country re-made in the spirit of our fathers and competent to perform its divine mission of carrying liberty and justice throughout the earth.

I have been thinking as I drove about the streets of your splendid city this morning, of that great migration which saved this noble and smiling land to our American republic. I have been thinking of that worn and travel-stained and wearied procession that came across the long trail in the forties and saved the Oregon country for the United States by taking possession of it in the name of the American republic.

This noble city, these splendid palaces, your comfort and your luxury, all rest upon the endurance, the hardships, the sacrifices and suffering of those early pioneers. It is not the possession that counts; it is the building. It is not your luxury and your comforts, it is not your palaces and your wonderful railroads, that toughen the sinews and energize the brain cells and broaden the view and give indomitable courage to manhood, that make a state like this. It is the hard work, the early sacrifices, the sufferings — and the liberty that is founded upon hardship, upon sacrifices and upon sufferings. It is not only eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty; it is eternal struggle which is the price of liberty. The test, the first and great test, is not between German troops and American troops, or German troops and French and Russian troops. It is between the great and

noble qualities of American nature and the degrading tendencies that come with luxury and wealth and prosperity and tend to drag men down from effort and from sacrifice.

We are in this war and we have got to stay in it, and we have got to go on with it, and we have got to make our sacrifices, because we are fighting for our own liberty. We are fighting for the deliverance of this dear country of ours whose freedom and justice have given us all our opportunities and which we would hand down undivided and unimpaired to our children's children.

Do not argue about the cause of the war. Do not argue about why we are in the war or whether we should be in the war. Do not argue the whys and wherefores, but realize this, that the time has now come when America's liberty, America's justice, the independence and freedom of every one of us, is a stake for which we must fight. If we are not all hypocrites, if all our profession of love for country, if all our devotion to the ideals of the fathers be not rank hypocrisy, now when the great test has come we will gird our loins and go into the battle with whole and fearless hearts and fight for America as no people ever fought before.

ADDRESS AT A RECEPTION BY THE CITY OF NEW YORK, CITY HALL, AUGUST 15, 1917

A great popular reception at the City Hall was tendered to the Russian Mission by Mayor Mitchel upon its arrival in New York City, August 15, 1917. The welcoming address was made by the Honorable Oscar S. Straus, chairman of the Mayor's committee, who said among other things:

It will ever be remembered that America was first among the nations to extend its official recognition to the new Russia, and to welcome her to the family of democratic nations. The President deemed it of the first importance to interpret the spirit of our great democracy, with its trials, struggles, and triumphs, to our youngest co-partner and ally, and he selected from among all our citizens the foremost of our constructive statesmen, and placed him at the head of this important and extraordinary Mission.

Then the Mayor presented to Mr. Root the first medal of valor of the National Arts Club, awarded to Mr. Root for his acceptance of what the Mayor called "the very real hazards of this Mission." He then introduced Mr. Root, who spoke as follows:

THIS medal is the first object of desire, the first fruit of this Mission, which has not been shared with perfect equality among all the nine members of the mission. I hope that it will not prove a golden apple of discord among us. I must attribute the selection of myself as its recipient to that friendship that is so grateful to the heart among the people of my own home. I beg you, sir, to convey to the National Arts Club an expression of my sincere and grateful appreciation for the undeserved honor which they have done me.

The duty which was imposed upon the special Diplomatic Mission to Russia was one of very great importance and significance, but its performance required no extraordinary qualities and involved no extraordinary merit. The way was plain and we had, each one of us, merely to do our bit as best we could in the discharge of a simple and imperative duty. We did the best we knew how. We did it with the most

perfect harmony and with whatever strength comes from united action. Drawn from all parts of the country, selected with an evident purpose to represent different points of view of the American people -- a soldier, a sailor, a manufacturer, a retired capitalist, a banker, a labor leader, a socialist, a religious worker, a New York lawyer -- we all were absolutely united in our conception of the spirit of our mission and in the union of effort to perform our duty. Yet it is inexpressibly grateful to us, sir, that in this great city to which we now return, we are thought to have done useful service, and that the belief in the usefulness of our service is sufficiently strong to move you and the distinguished citizens of New York who are about this circle to this outward manifestation of approval.

It is not the first time that the importance of the cause has been transferred to the individuals who have represented the cause. It was a great cause, it was a great errand. There never was in history a people finding itself in a more difficult and perilous position than the people of Russia found themselves in a few months ago. When the Czar was removed and his government was driven out, there was left a great people of one hundred and eighty million, covering a vast territory, without a government. They had never been taught to govern themselves. They had no institutions of national self-government; and no people, no democracy can govern itself except through institutions of government. The hundred and eighty million people of Russia were left without a government by the dethronement of the Czar, and they were left without any institutions of self-government. They had, moreover, in general, no knowledge, no intimate and personal knowledge of the methods and the necessities of self-government. The great body of the people were wholly ignorant of how to carry on a national government for themselves. They had been accustomed to receive orders and to obey.

They had no habits of thought which would enable them, the great body of them, to evolve institutions through which to govern. And so this vast people who had never been permitted to speak or write or think upon self-government were left confused, bewildered, gathering in little groups in aimless and endless discussion.

Then came the propaganda of the extreme socialists and anarchists, of the internationals, the analogue in Russia to the I. W. W. of this country; the men whose motto is that the worst is the best; the men who seek to destroy the industrial organization of the world, to destroy the nationalism of the world with a far-off dream in its place of a universal brotherhood to govern all the world in harmony and peace. These men were aided by thousands who had swarmed back to Russia from America, thousands who returned vilifying and abusing the land that gave them refuge, gave them security, gave them liberty to think and speak and act. These refugees returned to Russia declaring America to be as tyrannous as the Czar, and calling for the destruction, not for the setting-up, of competent government in Russia, and for the destruction of all governments, of America, of England, of France, of Italy, and incidentally of Germany. They poisoned the minds of the working-men, and of peasants and of soldiers. Their definite and distinct object was to destroy the whole industrial and national system of Russia. And they had power in Petrograd, for there at the beginning the garrison adhered to them.

Into this condition of vast confusion and bewilderment was thrust a great German propaganda. Thousands of German agents swarmed over the line immediately upon the coming of the revolution. They awakened all the pro-Germans in Russia. They spent money like water. Millions upon millions were used. They bought people; they bribed people; they bought newspapers; they established news-

papers; they circulated literature; they went to and fro among the troops at the front. They said, "Why go on fighting? This was the Czar's war; it was not your war; why go on? Let us have peace." The people of Russia, the soldiers of Russia, were wearied of war, like all the rest of Europe, and peace seemed so desirable to them that for the moment it seemed as if this German propaganda had captured Russia, had done what her arms never could do, captured Russia. The internationals, the extremists, who were preaching a great world union of human freedom, made common cause with the bribing and insidious agents of the German autocracy to overcome the freedom of Russia. Against these influences, in an attempt to build up a new republic, with the enemy at their gates, and the insidious influences sapping all their power, a few men in Russia made the bravest, noblest, most gallant fight of our time for the safety of human freedom and the building up of free self-government in their country.

It was the function of this Mission not merely to carry a message of friendship and good feeling from the United States to Russia. As events developed before we reached Russia, it became the function of this group of American citizens to carry to the people of Russia a message of faith in democracy; to say to them, "Take heart, be of good cheer, faint not, despair not. We say to you from the hundred million free people of America, who for one hundred and forty years have been fighting the battles of democracy, that there lives a power in democracy that will overcome all evil, and it is with you, and with it you will triumph." It was the function of this Mission to put courage and hope into many a faint heart, to point out that the way to safety led through the support, the earnest and active support of the existing provisional government of Russia; that no oratory, that no aimless theorizing could answer the purpose, but that

there must be government, and that the government they had must be supported, sustained, promoted, strengthened, if they would be free. Little by little that government, beginning with no power, a government merely of moral suasion, with no force to execute a decree, gathering to itself the forces of Russian thought and character, acquired the power, gradually secured confidence, secured the support of the garrison in Petrograd, began to restore discipline, to restore a consciousness that freedom was not that every man should do what he pleased, but that freedom was order, freedom was the reciprocal limitation of individual liberty. That government, gathering slowly the forces of Russia, at last came to the point where it was able to lift up its hand and say, "The time has come when those who fight against us must take up the sword, for they will perish by the sword." Since our departure from Petrograd, processes that began before have been going on along the lines that were explained to us before we left that country, and the results that the government then had in mind have been worked out and are manifest today, with Kerensky, that man of conviction, of intense purpose, of tremendous personality, devoted to his great cause to the last drop of his blood. Kerensky, who, when we were there, was agreed upon by the members of the government for his present position, now rules the destinies of Russia; and with him in the government are wise, prudent, sagacious men of affairs.

I know of no greater exhibition of competency in constructive government than has been given to the world by the provisional government of Russia during the past three months. So we have come back with faith in Russia, faith in the qualities of character that are the essential tests of competency for self-government, faith in the purpose, the persistency and the power of the Russian people to keep themselves free. And they know that they cannot be free,

that they cannot build up a structure of government based upon and conforming to the life and character and genius of the Russian people, if Germany is allowed to dominate in their land. They know it well. I do not know what the result of military operations will be; no man can forecast that; but I do know that Russia has found herself; she has found herself, and on every field, military and civil, she will give a good account of herself to the democratic world; and we need not blush for having extended our hand to her in friendship and brotherhood.

I have said that it was the function of this Diplomatic Mission to take to the Russian people a message of faith in democracy. My friends, we return to America to repeat that message. Here, as there, a German propaganda is seeking to sap the strength of this free democracy. Here, as there, German money is percolating throughout the country, buying men here and buying men there, inspiring the press here and the press there, building up a great concealed structure of real treason. Here, as there, there are weak sentimentalists who, speaking for peace and justice and harmony among men, lend themselves to the support and advancement of the most terrible enemy that peace and justice and harmony and humanity have had since Genghis Khan fell. Here, as there, there are men who proclaim their patriotism and sell their country. But here, as there, the time is at hand when the power of a democracy, long-suffering, indecisive at first, will gather to a point; and then when the power of the American democracy exerts itself against its real enemy within, let these men beware. No form of law, no fiction of theory will prevent the usages of war being applied to them. For a hundred and forty years, as we told the Russians, we have been fighting the hard battles of democracy. Democracy has not that power of instant action which characterizes a military autocracy. Democracy cannot command that

united action, that union of purpose and concert of forward motion which an autocracy can command; but democracy has its reserves of power that no autocracy can have, and those reserves are here. They are all about us. They are unexhausted. They are ready to be moved on, and they will be moved.

We bring back from Russia to you and to all our friends at home an echo of our message: have faith, be stout of heart, be courageous and hopeful; brush aside all trifling criticisms and doubts; believe in your own power; do not doubt the triumph of the democracy of America, or the triumph of that great world movement of democracy — that great movement of the human mind which is passing on over the continents to the exile of autocrats and the universal triumph of government by the people, lifting up all those who labor and endure to their inheritance of opportunity, of justice, and of liberty. Do not doubt its triumph for a moment. God in the heavens has manifested His eternal purpose, so that the simplest may read, that autocracy's days are doomed, and the triumph, the universal triumph of democracy approaches; and America, great democratic America, courageous and powerful, is still to do its mighty work in that regeneration of mankind.

FAITH IN RUSSIA

ADDRESS AT A RECEPTION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY

AUGUST 15, 1917

THE Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, now in liquidation, was intentionally separated from any concern with business, with trade, investment, or enterprise for money-making of any kind. This was done carefully, and it was insisted upon strenuously by the Mission itself in Russia, in order that our message to the government and people of Russia might be free from any suspicion or color of selfish purpose. Yet I wish to say a few words to you about the substantial elements in Russian life and Russian conditions which should enter into a judgment, on your part, as to the confidence to which Russia is entitled.

I have just been talking in the City Hall about the conditions in which Russia found herself when the government of the Czar was ended — and I need not repeat what I said there. The extraordinary ease with which the Czar's government was removed, was due not merely to the fact that it was an autocracy, but also to the fact that it did not govern efficiently; it was not up to the job; it had allowed Russia to drift into a position where there was vast confusion and the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. The government had become, practically, merely a government of suppression, a government of negatives that ceased to lead the people, so that the Czar and the bureaucracy were slipped off as easily as a crab sheds its hard shell when the proper time comes.

And then Russia was left without a government. The laws which had their virtue from the command of the Czar seemed to have lost their sanction and moral force; the police dis-

peared; they were chased out, and those that were not disposed of in that way speedily became invisible. The Duma, in its last act, appointed a provisional government — that is, it appointed a number of gentlemen to fill the places of the heads of the executive departments — but that government had no power. It took up the machinery of administration, but it had no power to enforce a decree. The soldiers of Petrograd, who had been the physical force of the revolution, deferred to a voluntary organization of deputies of working-men and soldiers, who met in Petrograd, twenty-five hundred of them, and discussed and passed resolutions. The soldiers were with them, and the provisional government, while carrying on the machinery of administration, had no power to enforce a decree, and anybody in Russia was practically free to do anything he chose. Russia was under the control of thousands of local committees all over that vast land, without any relation to each other, and without any subordination to the machinery of the government in Petrograd. Now, not only was this acephalous condition created, but the people had never been thinking about the machinery of government, they had no institutions through which to carry on self-government. They had no habit of thought which would enable them to create institutions readily for national government. They were dazed, confused, bewildered. Up to the revolution it had been a criminal offense to hold meetings and discuss public questions. Under the rulings of the police three was an unlawful crowd, so that if three men undertook to talk about the weather in the street, they were required to move on or were arrested. Immediately after the revolution all Russia began to meet and discuss. That was the condition when the Mission reached there.

Now, into that state of affairs there came intervention by that malevolent power which is intermeddling with the

affairs of every nation upon earth, stirring up discord, stimulating, feeding, financing all the forces of evil — doing it here among us now. That power that finds its account in alliance with all evil passions, all the sordid impulses of humanity in every nation in the world, entered into Russia. Thousands of its agents poured over the border immediately upon the revolution. All the pro-German sympathizers in Russia were visited and spurred to action. Newspapers were purchased, and newspapers were established, literature was distributed, and a great propaganda went on to fill the minds of the simple-minded people, who had never thought or talked about political affairs, to fill their minds with the German view of the war and their duty. The men who correspond to the I. W. W. here, the extreme socialists and anarchists, with whom the German agents made common cause, preached and sought to bring about the destruction of the industrial and financial system in Russia, the destruction of nationalism in Russia, under the promise to the peasants and the working-men of a universal brotherhood of the proletariat of the world, which should destroy all national government, and bring in a universal reign of peace and brotherly love, not suggesting to them what Germany might do in the meantime if the national force of Russia was destroyed for the purpose of bringing about the millennium.

Notwithstanding all this, in a country with no central government that had power to enforce its decrees, in a country with no police, a country in which the sanction and moral obligation of the laws had disappeared with the disappearance of the Czar, there reigned order to a higher degree than has existed in the United States of America during this period.

In the first enthusiasm for freedom and in the liberation of political prisoners, a great many ordinary criminal prisoners were also released, and they went about and committed some

depredations which of course all found their way into the newspapers; but even with that, the general average of peace and order, of respect for property and life in Russia, was higher than could reasonably be expected from any hundred and eighty million people in the world under any government.

Now, that extraordinary phenomenon called for a study, a careful study, not merely from the newspapers or from talking with government officials, but by countless serious interviews and conversations with men of all grades and stripes and callings and conditions of life; and these studies satisfied all the members of this Mission that the Russian people possessed, to a very high degree, qualities that are necessary for successful self-government. They have self-control equalled in few countries of the world. They have persistency of purpose; they have a most kindly and ingrained respect—not only respect, regard—for the rights of others. They will not willingly do an injustice to any one, and that sense of justice carries with it a broad charity. They have a noble idealism which is developed and exhibited in the minds that are enlarged by education, and they have a strong sense of the mission of liberty in the world, and they have an extraordinary capacity for concerted action. That is shown in their self-government in the village community in which their little affairs are dealt with in the most every-day method of discussion—agreement—subordination of individual views to the general opinion; in the zemstvos which take in a little larger scope; in the town councils and in the union during the war of these local agencies for general purposes, the union of zemstvos and the union of the war munition committees, which are all working together most successfully and practically. There you see the union of citizens for political purposes which comes very close to government. So we came to the conclusion that the Russian

people have, in a very high degree, the qualities necessary to create and maintain a successful free government.

That is the test. There can be no more fatal gift to a people than the duty of self-government when their characters are not equal to the performance of the duty. The question of a people's maintaining their freedom is not to be determined by the little spectacular incidents which are picked up and published with headlines in the newspapers. The question is to be determined by the underlying and real character of the people. If their character is right, against all enemies and all misfortunes they will win through to established freedom. If their character is unequal to the task, all the aid of all the great countries in the world cannot give them their freedom. Freedom must find its foundation, its sure foundation, within the people themselves, and we think the Russians have that sure foundation.

Now there is great financial difficulty in Russia; the old régime brought the country into a very involved and critical condition financially; and there is great disturbance industrially. But when I have met people, and I have, a great many, who shake their heads over the industrial and financial conditions there, I have thought always, with a cheerful reassurance, of what a character these people have, and I have remembered that our dollar in the Civil War was as low as the Russian rouble, and I have no doubt that the character of the Russians will pull up their finances just as the character of Americans pulled up our finances.

I remembered, also, that in a country where eighty-five per cent of the people are land-owning peasants, industrial and financial difficulties do not cut so deep as they do in a country which is chiefly industrial in the ordinary sense of the word. There is no such convulsion caused by troubles which affect only fifteen per cent of the people, as where there are troubles which affect the whole; that is, the more highly

organized, industrially and financially, a country is, the greater ruin brought by industrial and financial difficulties. With Russia, all financial trouble that there is or may be, passing over the heads of eighty-five per cent of the people, affects them little.

A schedule, an appraisement of the property of Russia — that is, the available property which could be used for the production of income, or sold for productive purposes — has just been made; it has been made under the direction of Mr. Pakrovsky, former minister of finance under the Czar's government, a gentleman whose ability and integrity are most highly respected, and while it is not completed in detail, he finds that a moderate appraisement of that property, appraised just as you would appraise the property of any corporation, exceeds over sixty billion dollars. So you have a background against which to consider Russia — this vast property, the value of which of course depends upon the maintenance of a stable government, protecting property rights, and for the existence of such a government you have the true character of the Russian people and their respect for property rights. You have that vast country to be opened, to be developed, the great stretch through Siberia, from the Urals to the Pacific, with unimaginable wealth of the same kind which has made the power of our great republic. You have the wealth, you have the character, you have the opportunity for development, and with these, I feel certain that Russia is going to create and maintain a free self-government which will make her a republic worthy to stand side by side with the great republic of the United States, and a republic which will spur us to higher effort in order that we may be worthy to stand with her.

There is but one danger I see, and that is that Russia, God forbid it, may be overwhelmed by Germany; and if that were to happen, the development of the free institutions in

Russia, adapted to her life and character and the genius of the Russian people, would be made impossible. The Russians know that — the thoughtful men of Russia know that — and, with courage worthy of all honor, with courage worthy of imitation by us, they are wrestling mightily to prevent that great misfortune. No one can tell what the outcome will be, but this is certain, that Russia, tired of the war, worn and harried by war; Russia, which has lost seven millions of her sons, with every village in mourning, every family bereaved; Russia has again taken up the heavy burden; she has to a great extent restored the discipline of her army; she has put away the bright vision of peace and rest, and returned yet again to the sacrifice and the suffering of war in order that she may continue free. Ah! If we love freedom, if we are true children of our fathers, and cherish their ideals, confidence and hope will go out from us to those brave Russians who are fighting our battles as they are fighting their own; and we will uphold the hands of our Government and encourage the spirit of our people to do our duty beyond measure, to help them in their great and noble work.

SYMPATHY WITH RUSSIA

ADDRESS AT THE BANQUET OF THE AMERICAN BAR
ASSOCIATION, SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK
SEPTEMBER 7, 1917

At the conclusion of its Saratoga session, the American Bar Association tendered a banquet to Mr. Root, at which the toastmaster, ex-Senator George Sutherland of Utah, the president of the Association, introduced Mr. Root in the following words:

The American Bar Association, departing from its usual custom, has given this dinner in honor of its most distinguished member, a lawyer of profound learning and great ability, schooled in the best traditions of a noble profession. It has been my good fortune to know, more or less intimately, a large proportion of the public men of my generation, and to be reasonably familiar with the history of the others, and I take advantage of this occasion to say—not by way of idle compliment, but as a matter of profound conviction—that this great American whom we thus honor will pass into the history of his country as the safest counsellor and wisest statesman of his time.

I present with pleasure—I present with very real and great affection, our distinguished guest and former president, Elihu Root.

IT is very hard to speak after such an introduction. It is hard to forget the sense of unworthiness caused by such words as the too partial friendship of Senator Sutherland has permitted him to use; but who could remain silent who has a voice in these days? Who can think of his own personality amid the tremendous issues that confront us and the terrible responsibility that rests upon us? Men are nothing. From out of the dead level of ordinary humdrum life, from ease and comfort, the struggle for place and fortune, the common things of every day, the rising feeling of duties and ideals and devotion sinks all personality.

There are no persons now; there is only a country. There are no countries now: there is only a world in which the great conflict has come between right and wrong, between the angels of light and the angels of darkness; and we are,

each one of us, but an indistinguishable particle in the great conflict that is to determine the future of mankind.

I promised some of my friends, in response to their questioning, that I would tell you something tonight about Russia. I can do it only because it is a part of the great drama of intense interest that has turned this meeting of the American Bar Association from a conference over dry laws and technical and scientific questions into a great patriotic meeting.

Let me say something about Russia, poor, harried, bleeding, agonizing Russia. In March last, the government of the Czar had brought Russia to the verge of bankruptcy. The Czar was dethroned, not merely because he was an autocrat — that would have waited until the war was over — but because his government was incompetent and dishonest; because the men who were controlling in that government were bought with German money and were traitors to their country, to the great cause in which Russia had enlisted.

The Duma was in session, and wise and able men in that body perceived that the bureaucratic government was making its arrangements for a separate peace, in violation of the pledged faith of Russia; a peace which would have inflicted intolerable shame upon their country through desertion of those other nations who had come to the aid of Russia in her struggle. Wise and able men there charged the government with the purpose to make a separate peace. The Czar issued an order that the Duma dissolve, and the Duma refused to dissolve, and that precipitated the revolution.

Upon that, the great body of socialists in Petrograd who had been attacking the government, had been forming their plans ultimately to overthrow the government, arose, took to the street, called upon the Petrograd garrison whom they had won over to their views, and drove out the police of the bureaucracy. The agents of the Duma called upon the Czar

for his abdication; and he abdicated. The Duma immediately appointed new heads of all the departments, who took possession of the machinery of government. The socialists formed themselves into a body which was known as the Council of Deputies of Workingmen and Soldiers, some twenty-five hundred in number, and they had adhering to them the Petrograd garrison. And then, with the Czar's government disposed of, disappearing in a night, there were left in Russia the heads of the executive department who controlled the machinery of administration, and the Council of Deputies of Workingmen and Soldiers, who had the control and leadership of the Petrograd garrison, that is to say, the physical force, in their control. The provisional Council of Ministers appointed by the Duma had the machinery of government, but they had no power to execute their decrees. The Council of Deputies of Workingmen and Soldiers, a purely voluntary body, had the physical power as they had the garrison with them, but they had no competence for government, and they did not undertake to carry on government; and so the country stood with no effective government, a government of moral suasion alone; and that vast people of one hundred and eighty million, covering one-sixth of the habitable globe, looked about in bewilderment and confusion, and began to discuss their rights, their powers and duties; began to rejoice in the new freedom from oppression.

Four months ago, when the Diplomatic Mission from the United States landed at Vladivostock, there were thousands of committees which had been formed in every town and in every city, and almost every village, in every garrison and camp and division and regiment of the great Russian army. These thousands of committees undertook to regulate their local affairs. They had no relation to each other, and they had no subordination to any general government. Seventy-five per cent of the people could not read and write. With a

very few exceptions, they had no knowledge and no experience in self-government. They had no institutions through which to govern, and we all know there can be no self-government except through institutions of government. Yet in that extraordinary condition there was as perfect order in Russia as existed in the United States.

In Petrograd not a policeman was to be found; the old police of the bureaucracy had been chased away, gone into hiding, or into exile; and no police had taken their place. But there was no time during that period when a young woman could not have walked from one end of Petrograd to the other at any hour of the day or night in perfect safety.

Then they addressed themselves to the novel subject of forming a government to take the place of the old autocracy. There were two elements, the socialists, who, of course, desired a government of socialism, and the great body of the Russian people, most of them land-owning peasants, with a small proportion of business men and a small proportion of large land-owners; and these two elements stood and looked at each other in doubt as to what they should do, wholly inexperienced; and they began to take the first steps towards the creation of government.

The socialists had two wings — the moderate and reasonable socialists of the American type, the same kind who run a candidate for President every four years now, with cheerful hope; and the extreme socialists of the German type, who demanded immediate and full application of the theory of socialism. They proposed that there should be an immediate destruction of all capital. They proposed to destroy the industrial organization of Russia; and they proposed to destroy the nationalism of Russia in the expectation of substituting for nationalism throughout the world the “Universal Brotherhood of the Proletariat” which should immediately usher in the millenium. Their idea was that they

would have no national government in Russia, and they would immediately destroy the national governments of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and incidentally Germany. The key of all that went on in Russia through months was the desire to separate the modern and reasonable socialists, who sought to obtain the fruition of their theories through building up national democracies, from the extreme German type of socialists who sought immediately to apply their wild and vague theory.

Then there came a tremendous German propaganda. Thousands of German agents came across the border after the revolution; and they spent money like water, no one can tell how much they spent. They stirred up all the German sympathizers in Russia. They purchased newspapers, established newspapers, and printed other literature; they went up and down the front, talking to the soldiers in the trenches and in the reserve camps. They said to the Russian soldier, "Why do you fight? This was the Czar's war. The Czar is gone now. Why do you keep on fighting?" They said also to them, "Why do you kill us? We are your friends. Why do you want to get killed yourselves? It is very unpleasant. You had better go home and take part in the division of the land. All the land in Russia is to be divided, and if you do not hurry home, you will be left." And those millions of men who did not read were talked to in this way, and when it was said, this was not their war, they were compelled to realize that it was not. Nobody had told them what the war was about; they had never been instructed about it; they had no knowledge of the great issues involved; and accordingly, by the millions, the Russians left the trenches and the camps and wandered all over the country, finding their way back to their homes; and all through the Russian army the idea ran that peace had come, and there was no further occasion for war. And so that government stood

without any power in the government to enforce a decree, with an army wearied of war, as all Europe is wearied of war today, tired of sacrifice and suffering, glad to have the killing and maiming come to an end; glad that no more lives were to be added to the millions who had been lost in Russia; and that peace and order were to reign.

Discipline in the army, of course, then disappeared. The officers who had been severe in their treatment of the soldiers were dismissed and sent away, the soldiers' committees took charge, and with Germany at the gates a condition existed in which the successful prosecution of war was impossible. There was no government which had the power to enforce law. Indeed, the law had lost its sanction as law; it had died with the Czar. It was not like our law, which is made by the people — it was made by the Czar, and the Czar had gone, and his word had no further authority. There was no law, no power. The great body of the people, with little or no understanding of the great questions confronting them, delighted in the sense of freedom; but they respected each other's rights, and they maintained order. The German agents made common cause with the extreme and unreasonable socialists, and to them were added those unknown secret agents of the bureaucratic government. And the extreme wing of violent destructive socialism, which corresponds to the I. W. W. in our own country, and the agents of the old secret police and the agents of Germany, made common cause in attempting to destroy all industry, all property, all capital and all effectiveness of government in Russia.

Now, in that condition a few men — very few at first — stood up and spurned the offer of a separate peace from Germany. They said, "We will not stain our country by this disgraceful conduct. We will maintain the war; we will fight for the liberty which we have newly won; we will begin the career of a new democracy of Russia, with faith and

honor. We will save the people of Russia from the disgrace which these men seek to put upon it."

They were the provisional government of Russia. Wisely, patiently, they separated the reasonable socialists from the extremists. They finally won them over, and when they had won them over, they had won the Petrograd garrison also. And when they had won the Petrograd garrison, with the moderate socialists, they were ready to govern.

I got up one morning in the quarters of the Diplomatic Mission, in the Winter Palace. We had on one side of us, occupying a part of that vast pile, a great military hospital filled with wounded. On the other side, in the rooms which had been used as a prison for the palace, there were confined some eighty anarchists who had just been arrested the night before. Across the way were the barracks of the most mutinous regiment of the Petrograd garrison. I looked out of the window into the court-yard of the palace, and there I saw the court-yard filled with Cossacks, who were standing and sitting about, sharpening their swords, and I said, "The time has come when the government of Russia can begin to govern." And it had. The Cossacks went out into the streets of Petrograd, and from that time on the flag of destructive revolutionism, the black flag of the men who sought to destroy Russia, has been driven from those streets.

Many disturbing things have been reported in our newspapers of events in Russia, happening during the past two months. But the changes in the government of Russia which took place after our Mission left, until its return home, were the changes which were marked out, and explained to me, before we left. What will happen in the future, of course, no one can tell.

What was represented as being another revolution, what was represented as being the surrender of the government to turbulent forces, was but the accomplishment of a settled

purpose long ago determined upon and explained to me before we left — the purpose to put Kerensky in the place he now holds, with the power to restore order.

Through his extraordinary power — and he has extraordinary power, this young man in the thirties, with amazing intensity, with power to put every drop of blood in his body into his words when he reaches out and seizes upon the souls of his audience, and with a devotion to his country, a flaming enthusiasm for liberty and order never surpassed in our day — Kerensky set out upon the tremendous task of restoring at once the power of a civil government to maintain order in Russia and restore the morale of the Russian army.

He has wise and skillful and able men with him, men who joined in putting him at the head of the government, not seeking their own elevation, not seeking their own aggrandizement, but seeking to put at the head of the government the man whom they recognized as the most fit man to do the great work that had to be done.

He has, in a great measure, restored the morale of Russia's army, and that army which from the Baltic to the Black Sea had agreed that there was no more fighting to do, is now fighting along that line, and is now dying in the trenches along that line. Ninety-five per cent of them have gone back to the terrible task of maintaining the integrity of their country against the advance of the Germans.

Here and there is a soft spot, here and there is a place where German corruption and German influence have won over an officer or a regiment, and when that soft spot is touched — and the Germans know where it is — there is a disaster, but still they fight on.

The newspapers are filled with accounts of disputes, of political conflict, but how is it possible for a nation which began in the beginning with no government at all, with no institutions, with no habits of thought or action adapted to

the exercise of the powers of government, how is it possible for them to avoid disputes and controversies ? When you read in the newspapers about what happens in Russia, I beg you to remember how the people of Europe looked upon the condition of America for many a long year after the peace that ended the American Revolution. How certain they were that the new experiment in democracy was a failure. How they sneered and laughed at the presumptuous farmers who sought to govern themselves. I beg you to remember what Europe thought of the condition in America in those long dark years of civil war, when it was believed that the American experiment had failed at last.

I beg you to consider if a true statement were made and communicated by cable to Russia, of all that has been happening in these United States during the past four months, of the riots, of the pacifist meetings, of the seditious press, of the unblushing effrontery of treason throughout this land, what effect that would have upon Russia. I beg you to consider whether if that were sent over to Russia, it would not seem worse to the Russians than the story which comes to us from Russia today.

A terrible task they have undertaken. Often their hearts must faint; often it must seem as if they were fighting to accomplish the impossible; but they have one thing upon which they can rely, that is the character of the people of Russia. Why was it that when no police and no government was there, order was maintained in Russia ? It was because the Russian people have in the highest degree the qualities that are necessary to successful self-government.

They have self-control. They are naturally law-abiding. They have natural consideration for the feelings and the interests of others. They have a natural sense of justice. They would not willingly do injustice to anyone in the world; and their justice is enlarged and ennobled by beautiful

charity. They are the kindest people towards the unfortunate and the erring that I know of. With all that, they have persistence and rugged continuance of purpose, and they have an extraordinary capacity for concerted action which has been shown in their local self-government. In their village communities they long have managed their own affairs in their little town meetings with the mayor presiding, where they would discuss and take the will of the majority, and everybody agreed to it. They have done the same in their zemstvos, and they have gone further. This war was not well carried on by the old régime, and in order to carry it on, the Russian people rose and formed combinations of their own zemstvos into an all-Russian union of zemstvos. They formed special war munition committees; and it was these bodies of zemstvos and the war munitions committees that kept the armies going after the old Russian régime had been swept aside. Thus they have carried their self-government into the national field until they have attained a condition which approaches national self-government. In their business affairs they show self-government. I went in Moscow, to the Narodny Bank, or the People's Bank, and saw the corporation employees gathered together, and speeches were made to and fro, and among others, a young man arose and said he would like to tell about the flax industry in Russia. He said that the flax people, great numbers of them, had united and formed a union for the purpose of marketing their flax and purchasing their necessary supplies, and they had succeeded in that, and they were carrying on their business, by the agencies that they created at a cost not exceeding two and a half per cent. Now, probably the majority of them were unable to read and write. Those people, those peasants, with those qualities, are competent to create and maintain a self-government. That is the test. If people have the character of a self-governing people, they will win out in

self-government. If they have not that character of self-government, then all the powers on earth will not make them a self-governing people. Above all this they have a noble idealism. They are capable of entertaining conceptions of something above the ordinary affairs of every-day life. They are capable not merely of forming and maintaining self-government, but they are capable of doing great things for the betterment of mankind and the advancement of liberty.

To preserve the liberty of those people, this little band of men striving to restore the morale of the Russian army, trying to teach those poor peasants in the army who do not read and write, teach them why they must be ready to sacrifice their lives; trying to show them that their liberty requires still further sacrifices from them; this little band of men agonizing with their fellow-countrymen, struggling with this mighty task, surely should have the sympathy and the aid of the people of this republic, who enjoy freedom and prosperity and opportunity through the hard sacrifices our fathers made.

I am glad to have gone to Russia because it has put into my heart a sympathy for those struggling people which makes me a better man. This war has done many things already. I know that for one battered old campaigner who has been through the rude buffets of life for half a century, it has dissolved that hardness of the heart which brings indifference to the dreams of youth. It has brought sympathy, ennobling sympathy, to us all. Sympathy for poor, struggling, bleeding Russia. Sympathy for little Belgium, like a ravished child trodden down by brutal and bestial force. Sympathy for the noble patriotism and lofty character of beautiful France. Sympathy for the patriotism that leads the Italians to the mountain summits for the recovery of Italia Irredenta. Sympathy for that great race which through a thousand years of stubborn and rugged individual independence has

developed the liberty we now enjoy. And for the mild and complacent surface kindness which we once professed for all the world, there has come a deep and real sympathy of the heart with all these nations that have become our allies! We are growing real instead of superficial. We are substituting reality for pretense.

But there is something more than mere sympathy that this war has already brought. We have been talking in this country of free lives and liberty and justice, of freedom and opportunity, of American institutions, of the mission of democracy, about the ideals of our fathers, and we have been talking from the teeth outward. We have not felt it. I will not say we were dead in trespasses and sins; but we were dead or sleeping in wealth and ease and comfort. The brutal power of Germany, which has repudiated everything that civilization has accomplished for the century past, which has repudiated the law of morals and declared the German state to be superior to all morality; which has repudiated the law of humanity, and has without quavering committed the most dreadful outrages in order that she might have the benefit of inspiring terror in the world, the brutal power of Germany has revealed at last to our comfort-loving people the unreality of our lives, and has shown, bare and naked, the dreadful, horrid truth of human nature unrelieved by morals or religion or humanity. It has shown to us as we never realized before, what liberty and justice, what humanity and compassion, what morality and right, really are.

We need not talk about the whys and wherefores of the war. It is here and the issue is drawn so clearly that a child could see. It is for the American people to determine whether they have the manhood to maintain the liberty that their fathers gained for them through sacrifice; the manhood to maintain the justice upon which we have prided ourselves; the manhood to defend those institutions of liberty

and justice which we would hand down to our children; or whether we shall submit and abandon them all.

The issue is clear and distinct between the maintenance of the American republic, free and independent; American justice to the rich and poor alike; American opportunity for the boy and the girl; and being so craven that we will leave our children to be subjected to the power of evil that ravished Belgium and Servia. Whether falsehood and faithlessness and cynical contempt for morals, and cold-blooded disregard of humanity, and utter absence of mercy and compassion and denial of human right, shall be the portion of our children, or whether the liberty which our fathers won shall be handed down to them by the manhood of our fathers' sons and the love of our children's fathers.

Ah! It has come not too soon. It was at the eleventh hour that we came into the vineyard. The great opportunity of the American people was slipping away before they could grasp it — the opportunity to make themselves into the image of our fathers. The opportunity is to die, if need be, and to give our dearest ones to death, that our country may live, that its liberty may live, that its justice may endure, that its opportunity for those who toil and endure, may continue. We have grasped the opportunity for that sacrifice and suffering through which we shall find our souls again.

I thought as I listened today to the sad story of Edith Cavell, that it could not be that an infinite God would permit such a dreadful injustice to overcome the world. I do not know. We cannot measure the providences of God; but I have faith in the power of God's people, and God's people are the democracies of the earth. They are not the czars or the kaisers or the emperors or the autocrats or the aristocracies of the earth; they are the democracies of the earth. And I have faith in the power of democracy triumphant.

I believe that struggling Russia and down-trodden Belgium and awakened England and enduring France and aspiring Italy and renewed America, fighting in God's name for the principles of His religion, for that compassion, that morality, that justice, which Christ preached upon earth, will overcome the forces of a dark and wicked past, and bring the world into a new day of brighter light and happier life. And in that faith, I live — with all the sorrows, the disappointments and the loss — I live a prouder American than I have ever been before.

POLITICAL ADDRESSES

THE CAMPAIGN OF 1904

ADDRESS AT BUFFALO, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 22, 1904

In the Presidential campaign and the intermediate congressional elections from 1900 to 1916, during which period Mr. Root served as Secretary of War and Secretary of State in the Cabinets of Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt, and as United States Senator from New York, he was one of the chief authoritative spokesmen of the Republican Party. His speech at Canton, Ohio, on October 24, 1900, in which he made the Administration's reply to the attacks of the opposition upon the Republican policy for the Presidential campaign of that year, appears at page 27 of the volume entitled "The Military and Colonial Policy of the United States" in this series.¹ Mr. Root's speech as temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention at Chicago, June 21, 1904, in which he sounded the keynote for the Roosevelt campaign, is printed at page 99 of the same volume. His address as chairman of the New York Republican Convention, February 15, 1916, is for the most part published under the title "Foreign Affairs 1913-16," in the volume entitled "Addresses on International Subjects."¹ Mr. Root delivered many political addresses in different parts of the country during these years and in subsequent campaigns, and one speech for each other campaign is preserved in this volume. These speeches epitomize the political history of the United States during the entire period from the Republican point of view, and are thus a permanent contribution to the history of the party and of the United States.

IT cannot be denied that this presidential campaign is of inferior interest to many which have preceded it. The reason is plain. The opposition to the present Administration has presented no real issues to the country for discussion.

The Democratic party adheres to its old position in favor of the free coinage of silver. The St. Louis convention refused not only to abandon the position, but even to concede that it had been settled against them.

The Democratic party adheres to its old position that protection is robbery and that tariff should be for revenue only. Its candidate says in substance that the business interests of the country need not apprehend injury from this source, because there is a Republican Senate which will prevent

¹ Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1916.

Democratic tariff ideas from receiving effect during the next Administration. Tariff discussion therefore would be academic.

The Democratic party demands still further legislation against trusts and monopolies, without telling what it should be; but its candidate says that the common law affords a complete remedy, and, in substance, that other and different laws are not needed. That appears to be an issue in the Democratic party — not between it and the Republicans.

The Democratic party and the candidate insist that we acquired wrongfully the title to the Panama Canal; but it is impossible to treat that assertion seriously when in the same breath they declare that we should keep the title and proceed to build the canal without delay.

Both the party and the candidate say that it is imperialism for us to hold the Philippines. But the candidate truly says:

The accidents of war brought the Philippines into our possession, and we are not at liberty to disregard the responsibility which thus came to us, but that responsibility will be best subserved by preparing the islands as rapidly as possible for self-government and giving to them the assurances that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it.

That is precisely what we are doing, and precisely those assurances have been given.

The only difference between us is that the Democratic party and candidate insist that we should make a promise to the Filipinos that when they are fit for self-government, whether that be ten years or fifty years hence, the United States will give them full independence, instead of leaving it for the people of the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands at that time to say whether full and absolute independence, or some modified relation insuring at once self-government and the stability and protection of that government will be best for their interest and ours. That question is not entitled to very much discussion now.

The course of development of the Philippine people may work out an answer to that question, or when the time for action comes it may prove to be complicated and difficult of solution; in any event it must be solved when the time comes, with reference to conditions in the Philippines and the Orient generally, which it is impossible to foresee now. Any attempt on our part to settle now the specific details of their action, in ignorance of those conditions would be both foolish and futile. Both parties agree that the people of the Philippine Islands are to have self-government as rapidly as they become fitted for it. That is the declared policy of the United States. Both parties are agreed that our present duty is to promote the attainment of capacity for self-government among the Filipinos, who are as yet far from possessing it. That duty we are performing, and overwhelming and indisputable testimony comes from the Philippine Islands that we are performing it well. Neither party disputes that, pending the performance of that duty at least, American sovereignty in the Philippines is to be maintained. The precise way in which that self-government, when attained, shall be made most effective, stable and secure against internal and external foes is not a present issue, and cannot be made a present issue before the American people.

I know of nothing more useful, more inspiring, more fraught with cheerful hope for the future of free government than the universal and intelligent discussion of great questions of public policy by the American people during a presidential campaign. That is the process which makes the people competent, and ever more competent, to govern justly and wisely. I have no sympathy with those who deplore the frequency of presidential elections and the interruption to business which they produce. The loss is overbalanced a hundred fold by the strengthening of the basis of all business and of all property, which under popular

government rest upon public intelligence and public understanding of political questions.

This year we have had little of such discussion. The Democratic attack has degenerated into a mere fusillade of fault-finding. Charges of extravagance without specifications, charges of disregard of the Constitution with trivial specifications having just enough substance for lawyers to base an argument upon, half-truths, small lies about the chairman of the Republican National Committee and about the President, spurious interviews between the President and trust magnates, garbled extracts from the President's writings, false statements made out of whole cloth, about what the President has said or written about farmers and about labor questions — these are the hand grenades of the Democratic onset. Just as President McKinley was called a mollusk by these same people because his manner was kind and gentle and reserved, so President Roosevelt is called violent and dictatorial because his manner is vigorous and graphic. When McKinley was President, Andrew Jackson was regarded by the Democracy as the true type. Now that Roosevelt is President, the "mature, experienced and undramatic" Buchanan is held up for imitation. Heaven save the mark! Do they want the country carried away bodily while the President sleeps? Ignoring all the great achievements of the Republican administration; ignoring prosperity and laws enforced at home, peace and honor and good-will abroad, great measures of policy carried to successful conclusion, honest and effective government; ignoring all these, the public is invited to consider in how many little ways of form and manner and method the Republican administration has departed from a standard of ideal perfection.

We have not been perfect; we are all erring mortals, and the Republicans who have been conducting the government

at Washington during the last few years have doubtless been imperfect enough to make it possible for their friends to feel affection for them. But political administrations are not to be compared with ideal standards of perfection. We are to be compared with the Democratic party. Government in this country, as in all English-speaking countries, is conducted by parties. The combined and concurrent action of many men in legislative and executive office uniting to work out problems of state along the line of principles upon which they agree is essential to the conduct of representative government. What evidence has the Democratic party given of its fitness to govern?

There was a Democratic party before the great upheaval and political realignment of the Civil War, which had political principles — a party that believed in a strict construction of the Constitution and the confinement of national power within the narrowest possible limits. It opposed and destroyed the national bank of the United States; it denied the right of Congress to appropriate moneys for internal improvements, or to enact protective tariffs, or to interfere with the extension of slavery, because it believed that the Constitution granted no power to do those things. Dominated by the master minds of the South, it was vigorous, able and competent to govern. It annexed Louisiana; it seized upon Florida; it made war upon Mexico; it enforced the Fugitive Slave law; with fire and sword it carried slavery across Missouri on to the virgin soil of Kansas and Nebraska. And, when the awakened conscience of the North had decreed that its rule should end, with splendid audacity it welcomed the ruin of the Union which it had so long governed.

Since the Civil War there has been no such Democratic party. There has been an opposition, organized under the name of the Democratic party. It has been composed of incoherent and warring factions, agreeing upon no principle,

faithful to no principle, believing in no principle, and held together solely by a desire to turn the Republican party out of office and secure the offices in its place. There is nothing in common between the old-fashioned gold standard business men of the East who call themselves Democrats and the populistic followers of Mr. Bryan in the West who call themselves Democrats, while the representatives of the South, elected without reference to any national issue, but with sole reference to the questions arising from the presence there of the black race, agree some of them with Republican doctrines, and some with ancient Democratic doctrines, and some with new Populistic doctrines. For forty years the controlling motive which has shaped Democratic platforms has been the desire to catch the public fancy of the moment, and their only consistent rule of action has been to affirm what Republicans deny and deny what Republicans affirm.

What do they really believe now as to the strict limitations of the Constitution upon the powers of the Federal Government? Listen to this declaration, repeated in Democratic platform after platform:

Resolved, That the Constitution does not confer upon the general Government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements.

Now read the Democratic platform of 1892:

The Federal Government should care for and improve the Mississippi River and other great waterways of the Republic, so as to secure for the interior states easy and cheap transportation to the tidewater.

The platform of 1900:

We favor an intelligent system of improving the arid lands of the West, storing the waters for purposes of irrigation, and the holding of such lands for actual settlers.

And the platform of 1904:

We favor liberal appropriations for the care and improvement of the waterways of the country. When any waterway, like the Mississippi

River, is of sufficient importance to demand special aid of the government, such aid should be extended, with a definite plan of continuous work until permanent improvement is secured.

We oppose the Republican policy of starving home development in order to feed the greed for conquest and the appetite for national prestige and display of strength.

We congratulate our Western citizens upon the passing of the measure known as the Newlands Irrigation act, for irrigation and reclamation of the arid lands of the West. . . .

We call attention to this great Democratic measure, broad and comprehensive as it is, working automatically throughout all time without further action of Congress. . . .

Read the platform of 1896:

We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Read the platform of 1904:

We demand a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against all such trusts, combinations and monopolies; and we demand the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to effectually suppress them.

Read the New York state platform of 1902:

We advocate the government ownership of the anthracite coal mines by right of eminent domain with just compensation to the owners. Ninety per cent of the anthracite coal mines of the world being in the state of Pennsylvania, national ownership can be but in the interest of the whole people.

Is it not plain that to get votes in the Mississippi Valley, to get votes in the states embracing the arid lands of the West, to get votes among the people excited against great combinations of capital, and among the people who were suffering for want of coal, cut off by the strike in the anthracite regions, the construction of the Constitution which the Democratic party still professes in high-sounding general phrases, has been thrown to the winds?

What does the Democratic party really believe as to the tariff? Read the old declaration of 1856:

The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, and, by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

Read the platform of 1872:

Recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation.

Tariff of 1880:

A tariff for revenue only.

Platform of 1884:

The Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making the reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. . . . The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

That is sound protection doctrine. Platform of 1888:

A fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor.

Platform of 1892:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only.

Platform of 1904:

We denounce protectionism as a robbery of the many to enrich the few.

Here we have the votes of the American people asked for the Democratic party upon the ground that it is in favor of

free trade, upon the ground that the party takes no position whatever on the subject, upon the ground that the party will give adequate protection by levying duties always equal to the difference between the wages at home and abroad, upon the ground that protection is unconstitutional, and upon the ground that protection is robbery.

What does the Democratic party really believe upon the question of reciprocity? Under the McKinley tariff law of 1890, reciprocity treaties were made by President Harrison with Brazil, Nicaragua, Honduras, San Domingo; with Great Britain, covering British Guiana and the West Indies, and with Spain, covering Porto Rico and Cuba. Under those treaties in four years our exports to those countries increased twenty-six per cent, and our imports from them increased twenty-eight per cent, while during the same period our exports to other countries increased only three per cent, and our imports from them decreased twenty-seven per cent. This being an established Republican policy, the Democratic platform of 1892 declared:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural.

And, accordingly, after coming into power after the election of 1892, the Democratic party proceeded to repeal the law, and put an end to all the reciprocity treaties. The Democratic campaign book of 1902 declared:

Reciprocity is based on the same false theories as is protection, and, like protection, is a sham and humbug, and to most people has been and will ever continue to be a delusion and a snare.

Upon the passage of the bill which gave effect to the reciprocity treaty with Cuba in December, 1903, every vote

cast against the treaty in either House was Democratic, and a majority of the Democrats in the Senate voted against it.

Now, read the Democratic platform of 1904:

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining, or commerce.

The Democratic party, which regards reciprocity treaties with agricultural countries as a sham, of course does not regard Canada as an agricultural country! Read also the words of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in his letter of acceptance:

The persistent refusal of the Republican majority in the Federal Senate to ratify the reciprocity treaties enacted in pursuance of the policies advocated alike by Mr. Blaine and Mr. McKinley and expressly sanctioned by the fourth section of the Dingley act, is a remarkable exhibition of bad faith.

There is here absolutely no guiding principle of Democratic action, and no sincerity of Democratic profession. When the Republican party makes reciprocity treaties, the Democratic party is opposed to reciprocity; when the Republican party does not make reciprocity treaties, the Democratic party is in favor of reciprocity.

What does it really believe as to the Isthmian Canal? Listen to the declaration of the Democratic party platform of 1856:

Resolved, That the great highway which nature, as well as the assent of the states most immediately interested in its maintenance, has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans constitutes one of the most important achievements realized by the spirit of modern times, and the unconquerable energy of our people. That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exertion of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be suffered to impede or clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our government and the governments of the states within whose dominions it lies. We can, under no circumstances, surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

That was the platform on which was elected "the mature, experienced and undramatic Buchanan." Now read the Democratic platform of 1904, after the canal treaty had been made with the republic of Panama:

The Democracy, when intrusted with power, will construct the Panama Canal speedily, honestly and economically, thereby giving to our people what Democrats have always contended for — a great interoceanic canal.

Does it really believe that the title which it proposes to keep is bad, and that the policy declared in the platform of 1856 is wrong? Does the Democratic party sincerely believe that it is keeping the pledge of its platform of 1872:

We recognize the equality of all men before the law, and hold that it is the duty of government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political.

We pledge ourselves to maintain the union of these states, emancipation and enfranchisement, and oppose any reopening of the questions settled by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution.

Upon two great questions the majority of the Democratic party has been sincere, and upon both of them we are asked to drop the veil of oblivion. It was in favor of the extension of slavery; it was opposed to the continuance of the war for the Union. Its platform of 1864, which declared the war to be a failure and demanded its immediate cessation, was an appeal to the weariness and discouragement of our people under their great burdens, and was intended to break down the administration of Lincoln and bring about disunion. Four years later it declared in its platform of 1868 that the question of slavery and secession was settled for all time to come, never to be renewed or reagitated.

The Democratic party has been sincere also in its advocacy of dishonest money and debased currency. In its platform of 1868 it declared for the payment of the public debt in greenbacks, then irredeemable and at an enormous discount.

That was repudiation. In 1876 it demanded the repeal of the act for the resumption of specie payments, passed by a Republican Congress in January, 1875. In 1896 it demanded the free coinage of silver. In 1900 it repeated that demand and denounced the currency bill passed by the Fifty-sixth Congress to establish the gold standard. In 1904 it refused to abandon its position, and rejected from its platform the statement that the question of the standard was settled. Now we are asked to forget the record, because the Democratic candidate says the gold standard is settled.

But it is only by a party's record that we can know what confidence to place in its present professions and its present promises; and we learn from the record of the Democratic party that expediency, not conviction, the attraction of votes, not the impulse of principle, determine what the Democratic party shall profess and promise and what it shall omit from its declarations. Insincerity is its prevailing characteristic. There are no party beliefs, there is no party conscience, there is no continuity of purpose, or striving for consistency, or sense of obligation to past declarations. What the party would do if coming into power it is impossible to learn from its past. That would depend upon what individuals happened from time to time to be thrown to the surface in the struggle for office. A generation of attempts to pull down and destroy Republican administration upon ever changing and shifting grounds has left the so-called party without the constructive faculty or the capacity to govern.

Once since the Civil War the Democratic party has had the opportunity to show by practical test what it was. In the second administration of Mr. Cleveland the Presidency and both Houses of Congress were Democratic. During that administration the party demonstrated conclusively two things — one, that it had not the coherence and unity of

sentiment to make intelligent governmental action possible; the other, that the worst element of the party is the element that is sure to control.

Widely as some of us differ from Mr. Cleveland politically, we can recognize the admirable qualities which made his career so distinguished. His courage, his sturdy integrity, his strong sense, his sincere conviction, his former experience in the Presidency, his universal popularity among his party at the time of his second election, all contributed to inaugurate the Democratic experiment under the most favorable conditions. The result was a dismal and ignominious failure. Upon the record of that four years every sentiment of esteem and admiration for Mr. Cleveland is a condemnation of the Democratic party. The tariff bill framed according to Mr. Cleveland's views by the Wilson committee was distorted and misshaped by the Democratic majorities of Congress until the President declared that it meant perfidy and party dishonor, and he refused to put his signature upon it. The appointment of a free-trade Secretary of the Treasury, a free-trade Speaker of the House, a free-trade Ways and Means Committee, which followed the election of Mr. Cleveland, and the framing and discussion of the Wilson Tariff bill were accompanied by widespread disaster, the closing of mills and millions of workmen out of employment. The government revenues fell off enormously. It was necessary to borrow money to support the government and to maintain the statutory gold reserve. In the fourteen years which preceded March 1, 1893, the Republican party had extinguished the public debt to the extent of \$1,881,367,873; during the second administration of Mr. Cleveland the Democratic party increased the debt by \$262,000,000. I know nothing more pathetic in the history of American legislation than the earnest appeals of Mr. Cleveland in his

messages to Congress during the winter and spring of 1895 for legislative action to enable him more readily to meet the exigency which confronted his administration.

The Democratic Congress turned a deaf ear to his appeals. The very virtues for which we admire Mr. Cleveland separated him from his party in the Capitol.

Hatred of Cleveland and all that Cleveland represented was the dominant force in Congress. Warring factions unable to agree upon any great public question found a common ground in that. The feelings of the Whig party toward John Tyler, the feelings of the Republican party toward Andrew Johnson, were mild in comparison. The Populist Democrats of the West hated him for his conservatism; the intriguing Democratic politicians of the East hated him for his inconvenient adherence to the principles which he professed. Each faction hated all others. Mutual distrust and dislike paralyzed the forces of legislative majorities bound together by no ties of common principle. The country drifted through years of industrial depression and disaster, of poverty and distress, without any effective government until the first election of McKinley and a Republican Congress took the reins of power from the discordant Democracy and placed them in the hands of a party competent to govern. Modern Democracy triumphant for once had demonstrated its true character.

The record of those four years has never been discussed before the American people, because in the campaign which followed, the Democratic party itself repudiated and condemned the record of its own administration.

What cause is there to believe that it would do better if again placed in power? The arch enemies of Mr. Cleveland and all that he represents in policy and in purpose are Senator Gorman in the East and Mr. Bryan in the West. I don't know whether Mr. Cleveland would have accepted

another nomination for the Presidency, but it is common knowledge that the bitter opposition of those two men and their followers in the St. Louis convention made such a nomination impossible. Mr. Gorman today controls the Democratic campaign from the party headquarters in New York. Mr. Bryan today is furnishing the sole hope of the Democratic party in the state of Indiana.

Differing as widely as ever between themselves, they agree upon one thing, and one thing only; that no Democratic government shall be controlled by Mr. Cleveland or by Mr. Cleveland's friends, or by Mr. Cleveland's policies or methods. To them more than to any other Judge Parker would owe his election, if he should be elected.

Is Judge Parker abler and stronger, of higher courage and more commanding personality than Grover Cleveland? Is he better informed upon public affairs? Has he thought more deeply upon public questions? Is his statesmanship broader and more genuine? If not, what hope is there of better things with power in Democratic hands?

Compare the promise embraced in this Democratic record with the certainty of efficient administration demonstrated by the performance of the last two administrations.

The standard that the Democratic platform sets up for imitation in the Philippines is what the Republican party has done for Cuba, working along broad lines and far-seeing policies against the opposition and civil and aspersions of the Democratic party.

The opportunity to construct the Panama Canal, which with cheerful anticipation the Democratic party proposes to enjoy, was acquired by Republican statesmanship and effectiveness.

The good of the Filipinos, to whom the Democratic party professes such ardent devotion, is being attained under Republican administration by a government of which the

Archbishop of Manila, upon personal knowledge, makes the following statement:

I was impressed during my journeyings by the progress of American institutions among the masses of the people, the general happiness, the security of persons and property, and the supremacy of order and justice. I believe that under divine guidance the beneficent rule of America is destined ultimately to place the Christian Malay race on a moral and political plane that as yet has never been attained by an Oriental people. This task that the Americans have assumed they cannot shirk or abandon. This work that Governor Taft so auspiciously began and that Governor Wright continues must be carried to a triumphant conclusion.

The "open door" in the Orient, which the Democratic platform approved, has been held open by Republican diplomacy, and to that same diplomacy under Republican administration is accorded throughout the world an honorable leadership among the nations in promoting the peace of mankind. To this its effective devotion has been attested by the settlement of the Alaskan Boundary dispute, the settlement of the Pious Fund controversy with Mexico, the peaceful arbitration and settlement of the troubles of Venezuela, the promotion of the power and dignity of The Hague Tribunal, and the preservation of the integrity of China.

Practical legislation by Congress and effective enforcement of the laws against illegal trusts and combinations and secret rebates have set Republican performance over against Democratic declamation.

The measure for reclaiming and making habitable the arid lands of the West, which is now paraded as a Democratic measure, was a vague dream until it was embodied and urged in a message of our Republican President, and passed by a Republican Congress.

Rural free delivery of the mails, declared impracticable by the last Democratic administration, has relieved the isolation of more than twelve millions of dwellers upon the American farms.

The sound money basis of our prosperity was established by the Republican party against the frantic opposition and wild denunciation of the Democracy, as once before a Republican President and a Republican Congress had saved the national honor from the disgrace of Democratic repudiation.

A reorganized army, a real militia, active and enthusiastic, an enlarged and efficient navy, well equipped coast defenses adequate to the protection of our seacoasts, agriculture and business promoted, laws enforced and respected, prosperity, business activity and confidence at home, respect and honor for the American government and the American name throughout the world, unclouded peace with all mankind — all these testify to the rule of a party whose leaders are able, broad minded and public spirited enough to shake off petty prejudices, to rise above mean pride of opinion, and to agree among themselves upon broad lines of public policy; the rule of a party coherent, organized, disciplined for effective action; a party with traditions and principles and sincere purpose; a party strong, virile, competent to govern; a party under the leadership of a President who measures up to the full stature of moral and intellectual power which the pride and patriotism of Americans demand in an American President.

Into the hands of which party shall the government of our ever-growing, ever-developing, ever-progressing country, the country of our pride, our dearest hopes and our abiding love, be committed ?

THE DEMAGOGUE IN POLITICS

ADDRESS OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN THE CAMPAIGN OF
1906, UTICA, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1906

A DEMAGOGUE is one who for selfish ends seeks to curry favor with the people or some particular portion of them, by pandering to their prejudices or wishes or by playing on their ignorance or passions.

We are witnessing in the state of New York one of those tests of popular government which often have come in the past and always will come when a skillful demagogue attempts to get elected to office by exceeding all other men in the denunciation of real evils and in promises to cure them. Honest and well-meaning voters, smarting under the effects of political or social or business wrongdoing, naturally tend to sympathize with the man who expresses their feelings in the most forcible and extreme language, and who promises the most sweeping measures of reform; and in the excitement and heat of public indignation they are sometimes in danger of forgetting that he who cries "stop thief" the loudest may be merely seeking his own advantage, may be worthless as a leader, may belong to the criminal class himself.

The enemies of popular government have always asserted that the great mass of a people, and particularly the working people could not be trusted to reject appeals to passion and prejudice and follow the dictates of sober reason, to distinguish between mere words of violent denunciation and extravagant promise on the one hand, and proved capacity for useful and faithful service on the other, and that their suffrage would always go to the most violent and extreme agitator.

The believers in popular government have always answered that in a country where universal education goes with universal suffrage, the great mass of the people, and particularly those who are doing honest work, can be depended upon to inform themselves carefully and to think soberly and clearly about political questions, and that their plain, strong, common sense will surely detect and reject the self-seeking demagogue, however violent his denunciation of wrong and however glowing his promises of redress, and approve the genuine man, the competent man, even though he may not promise so much or puff himself so much or use such violent language.

I firmly believe that the contention of the friends of popular government is right; I believe that the people of this country and of this state, under our system of universal suffrage and universal education, are sure to come out right in the long run. Nevertheless it cannot be doubted that many workingmen in this state, good and honest men who are entitled to respect and who wish to do the best thing possible for their country, are about to strengthen the enemies and weaken the friends of popular government all over the world by voting for Mr. Hearst, who is just the kind of a demagogue that I have described.

He is indeed an especially dangerous specimen of the class, because he is enormously rich and owns newspapers of wide circulation, and he can hire many able and active men to speak well of him and praise him in print and in speech and in private conversation.

Not only is the cause of popular government in danger of suffering injury and discredit from the vote for Mr. Hearst, but genuine reform, the real practical redress of the evils complained of by the people, is in danger of being weakened and brought to naught by this attempt of Mr. Hearst to get himself elected governor of New York.

The evils which have come with the enormous increase of corporate wealth in recent years are real and serious; there have been many outrageous practices which ought to be stopped and many wrongdoers who ought to be punished. That should be done, not by lynch law but by the intelligent and wise action which befits a self-governing people, determined always to maintain the rule of law, by reforming the laws where they are defective, and enforcing the laws with fearless vigor against rich and poor alike, and for the protection of rich and poor alike.

Both of these require a high degree of intelligence, skill, and experience; declamation and denunciation and big headlines in the newspapers will not do the business. It is easy to cry "down with the corporations", but corporations are merely the forms through which the greater part of our enormous business is transacted; they are not formed by special privileges to a few; they are free to all; anybody can form a corporation by signing and filing a paper, just as anybody can form a partnership.

And the great mass of our business people, especially those engaged in manufacture, are doing their business through corporate form; our enormous manufacturing industry could not be carried on in any other way. If you destroy corporations, you close your mills and your furnaces, you stop the payment of wages, you destroy the purchasing power of the wage-workers, you reduce the sales of our merchants and the markets for farm products. Corporations are not bad in themselves, but the managers of some of them and of many of the greatest ones have used them as opportunities for wrongdoing, if not criminal wrongdoing.

The thing needed is to cut out the wrongdoing and save the business, and these corporations are of so many different kinds, engaged in so many kinds of varied and complicated business, so intimately connected with all the production and

trade and prosperity of the country, that the same kind of patient, experienced, and discriminating skill is needed for the process that the surgeon needs in cutting out a tumor from the human body and saving the life of the patient.

Now, this process of intelligent and effective redress of wrongs is going on; great and substantial progress has been made in it; laws are being re-formed so as to meet the present evils; laws are being enforced with vigor and success; malefactors are being punished according to law and not against law; skill and wisdom and efficiency and honest purpose, never surpassed in the history of this or any other country, have put their hands to the task and are pressing it forward with untiring energy.

The most conspicuous and fit representative of this great and beneficent work in this state is Charles E. Hughes. There was never occasion to feel more proud of the great profession to which Hamilton and Marshall and Webster and Lincoln and Tilden belonged, than when through the long and weary months of the insurance investigation, with patient and untiring industry, with courage, skill, and honesty, he followed step by step the clues which led through all the complicated affairs of the great companies to the laying bare of official wrongdoing. Neither wealth, nor power, nor social position, nor political influence turned him aside one hair's breadth from his course; nor did any thought of himself, any desire for popularity, any taint of self-advertising or self-glorification obscure his vision or affect his conduct. He was the skilled and single-minded instrument of inexorable justice.

When the facts were all uncovered, he arranged them and stated them so plainly that a child could understand their deep significance, and then wisdom of no common order guided his judgment upon the legislative remedies for which

the facts called. This work was worth more than millions of staring headlines and clever sensational editorials, more than a wilderness of promises from one who seeks to barter promises for votes. I cannot believe that the hundreds of thousands of policy-holders in this state are not grateful for this service, or that all good citizens who justly resented the wrongs which he uncloaked, would not be glad to have such a man empowered to continue just such service in all departments of our state government by his election to the governorship of the state.

The most conspicuous and fit representative of this same great and beneficent work in the Federal Government is Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States. Let me state some of the corporate evils with which he has undertaken to deal; not all, but the principal ones.

1. Many great corporations have united in the formation of so-called trusts to get rid of competition, create monopolies of the business in which they are engaged, restrict production, and put down the prices at which they purchase raw material and put up the prices at which they sell their products.

2. Many great corporations and trusts have undertaken to crush out their remaining competitors by unfair competition, and especially by securing lower rates of freight from the railroad companies for their products than their smaller competitors; and as the railroads are bound by law to give the same rates to all shippers this unfair advantage has taken the form of secret rebates.

3. Many railroad companies have exercised their arbitrary power to fix their rates by arranging them in such a way that even without giving rebates, they have favored the large shippers in special localities and have been unreasonable toward small shippers in other localities. By these unfair

means the big, rich corporations have been continually driving the small, weak men to the wall, taking away their business and increasing their own wealth.

4. The managers of many great corporations, not satisfied with the natural increase of successful business, have enormously increased their capitalization beyond either their investment or the value of their property fairly used in business. Much of the watered stock has been sold to innocent investors, much of it has been secured by the managers themselves, through various devices, for insufficient consideration. These greatly excessive capitals, and the necessity of paying interest upon them, have stood as barriers against the reduction of transportation rates or the prices of products to a point which would secure fair business returns.

5. The offending corporations have clothed their vast and complicated business affairs with a mantle of secrecy, so that it has been almost impossible to get at the facts of their offending, and quite impossible for any weak, private person or small corporation that has been injured by them.

6. One of the great obstacles to the redress of these evils has been the unwillingness or inability of the states to deal with them. It is difficult for any one state to control corporations doing business in all the states. The state cannot control interstate commerce at all. Many of the states have by their laws as well as by their administration facilitated and encouraged the objectionable practices.

Let me tell you that our own state is not blameless in this respect, and that we need a Hughes at Albany, with the skill and courage to deal with that subject as he dealt with the insurance subject. On the other hand, the Federal Government has been met at every turn by the difficulty of controlling state corporations in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them by the state in which they were created.

Against these battlements of wrong, the President has charged with all the energy and sincere conviction of his nature; he has waged and is waging open warfare not against wealth, but against ill-gotten wealth; not against corporations, but against the abuse of corporate power; not against enterprise and prosperity, but against the unfair and fraudulent devices of selfish greed.

The honest poor man who has felt the crushing power of unfair wealth may take heart, for the most powerful personality of our generation, from the vantage ground of the greatest office of our land, is leading the battle in his behalf; the honest rich man who fears that property may be endangered and prosperity checked may calm his fears; not a single principle is invoked in this warfare against corporate wrongdoing that has not for centuries been familiar to the common law of England and America; no control is asserted over business which was not recognized and approved in the days of Mansfield and Eldon, Marshall and Kent; but to exercise that same measure of control under the new conditions of our day new agencies and new methods have had to be provided by law and sanctioned by the courts.

For the accomplishment of this due measure of control, which from time immemorial our laws have recognized as necessary, the Government of the United States has taken up the task where the several states have failed, and is performing and purposes to perform its duty not beyond but to the full limit of its constitutional power.

The structure of our prosperity will not be weakened, it will be made strong and enduring by removing with the care of the experienced builder the rotten timbers of disobedience to law and disregard of morality.

The Republican Congress has stood loyally by the President; the act creating the Bureau of Corporations, the act expediting the trial of trust cases, the anti-rebate act, the

act for the regulation of railroad rates, have made possible redress which was impossible before. Under the direction of two successive attorneys-general of the first order of ability, sincerity, and devotion, in hundreds of courts, incessant warfare has been waged and is being waged under the Federal laws against corporate wrongdoers.

The Northern Securities Company, which sought to combine and prevent competition between two great continental railroads, has been forced to dissolve by the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. The methods of the Beef Trust in combining to suppress competition in the purchase of live stock and the sale of meat have been tried and condemned, and the trust has been placed under injunction to abandon those practices, by judgment of the Supreme Court.

The combination of paper manufacturers in the territory from Chicago to the Rocky Mountains, has been dissolved by the judgment of the Supreme Court, and the combination has been abandoned and the price of white paper in that territory has gone down thirty per cent. The Retail Grocers' Association in this country has been dissolved by decree of the court. The elevator combination in the West has been dissolved in like manner. The salt combination west of the Rocky Mountains has been dissolved by decree of the court.

The Wholesale Grocers' Association in the South, the meat combination and the lumber combination in the West, the combination of railroads entering the city of St. Louis to suppress competition between the bridges and ferries reaching that city, the Drug Trust, which suppresses competition all over the country, are being vigorously pressed in suits brought by the Federal Government for their dissolution.

The salt combination has been indicted and convicted and fined for failing to obey the judgment of dissolution. The Beef Trust has been indicted for failing to obey the injunction

against it, and has been saved so far only by a decision that it had secured temporary immunity by giving evidence against itself. One branch of the Tobacco Trust is facing an indictment of its corporations and their officers, in the Federal court in New York and the other branches are undergoing investigation. The lumber combination in Oklahoma is under indictment.

The Fertilizer Trust, a combination of thirty-one corporations and twenty-five individuals to suppress and fix prices, has been indicted, the indictments have been sustained by the courts and the combination has been dissolved. The ice combination of the District of Columbia is facing criminal trial. Special counsel are investigating the coal combination, and special counsel are investigating the Standard Oil combination.

Three of the causes won in the Supreme Court of the United States have furnished decisions of the utmost importance.

In the Tobacco Trust case of *Hale v. Henkel*, the Supreme Court denied the claim of the trust corporations to be exempt under the Constitution from furnishing testimony against themselves by the production of their books and papers before a Federal grand jury. Thus the protection of secrecy for corporate wrongdoing is beaten down.

In the Northern Securities case, the Supreme Court held that a wrong accomplished by means of incorporating in accordance with the express provision of a New Jersey statute was just as much a violation of Federal law as if there had been no incorporation. Thus the state rights defense of protection from favoring state statutes is beaten down.

In the Beef Trust case, the Supreme Court held that, although the business of manufacture was carried on within the limits of a single state, yet the purchase of the raw material in different states and the sale of the finished product

in different states brought the business within the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution and gave the Federal Government authority over it. Thus the defense that the state alone can deal with manufacturing corporations, however widespread their business, is beaten down.

The obstacles to the enforcement of the Federal anti-trust act thus removed are obstacles which stood in the way of all proceedings, and they had to be cleared away before any proceedings of the same character against the same classes of corporations could be successfully maintained. They have been removed, not by newspaper headlines and denunciation, but by skill, ability, and energy of the highest order.

After the Elkins anti-rebate law was passed by Congress in 1903, it was supposed, and the Interstate Commerce Commission reported, that the railroads had substantially abandoned giving rebates. Their good resolutions do not seem, however, to have lasted. The struggle for business enabled the shippers soon to secure a renewal of rebates, or, by ingenious devices, advantages equivalent to rebates.

Thereupon the Department of Justice began active prosecutions for the enforcement of the law. Fifty-three indictments have been found against hundreds of defendants, covering many hundreds of transactions. There have been fourteen criminal convictions. Fourteen individuals have been fined to the gross amount of \$66,125. Nine corporations have been fined to the amount of \$253,000. Thirty-five indictments are ready for trial in their regular order upon the court calendar.

The original statute provided only for punishment by fine. Last winter it was amended by providing for punishment by imprisonment, and if the fines imposed under the original law shall not prove to have stopped the practice, we shall see whether fear of the penitentiary under the amendment will not do so.

Under this statute also it was necessary to sweep away defenses which stood as barriers to general prosecution, and in the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad case, decided by the Supreme Court on the nineteenth of February of this year, and the Milwaukee Refrigerator Transit case, decided in the seventh circuit on the thirty-first of May of this year, the courts have held that the substance and not the form is to control in the application of the statute, and that, however the transaction may be disguised, an unlawful discrimination can be reached and punished. The way is therefore cleared for all other prosecutions.

The Railroad-rates act, which was the subject of such excited discussion during the last session of Congress, has already justified itself. Since the passage of the act, less than five months ago, there have been more voluntary reductions of rates by our railroads than during the entire nineteen years of the previous life of the Interstate Commerce Commission. On the single day August 29, 1906, two days before the act went into force, over five thousand notices of voluntary reduction of rates were filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission by the railroads of the United States.

Over-capitalization is an evil peculiarly within the control of state governments, and one for which we ought to have in every state capital a man who can do what Mr. Hughes has shown himself capable of doing; but the Federal Government, through the Bureau of Corporations, is going far on the road to a cure by getting at the truth and dispelling the darkness under the cover of which the evil has grown.

Nor should other evils with which the Federal Government is grappling be forgotten — the Pure Food act and the Meat Inspection act of the last session of Congress are protecting the food of the people against fraud and adulteration and contamination; justice from the employer to the employed

is advanced by the wise Employer's Liability act of the last session; the Federal contractor's eight-hour labor law, too long ignored, is being vigorously enforced, and every week come reports of new convictions for its violation; the safety-appliance law, discredited in the lower courts, has been taken by the Government intervening in aid of an injured employee, to the Supreme Court of the United States in a suit against the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and has been established upon a sure foundation by the decision of that great court.

All this has not been easy; it has required not merely skill and ability and patient industry and the tremendous personality of the President, against all powerful influences urging on Congress and lawyers and courts, but it has required and still requires persistency, long-continued and constant effort, a deliberate, settled, and unvarying policy.

That policy is now before the American people for their approval or disapproval, and it is confronted by two dangers.

The first danger is lest the people should refuse to return a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives, which has stood so loyally by the President, and should return a Democratic majority which will be in opposition to the President. Do not be deceived about that. Under our system of government, effective, affirmative governmental action requires the coöperation of both President and Congress; that coöperation can be had only with a House of Representatives of the President's own party. It cannot be had by rejecting and punishing the members of the House who have been working with the President in the past.

A Democratic House, in inevitable conflict with a Republican Senate, would not really help the Democratic party, but it would hinder, embarrass, weaken, and dishearten the President and his assistants in carrying on the policy in which they are engaged. Independent and patriotic Demo-

crats equally with Republicans ought to avoid a result so disastrous to our country.

It would be unpatriotic to deprive our government of the help, and this state of the credit, found in the able and experienced service of our respected and beloved Congressman, James S. Sherman.

The second danger is, lest in this greatest of states, the President's own state, the voters shall reject Mr. Hughes, who was the President's own choice for the nomination, who by his character and his achievements has shown himself fit and competent in the great office of governor of this state to help hold up the President's hands and to carry on in the state the same policy that the President is carrying on in the nation.

What evidence has Mr. Hearst produced of his fitness for this office?

Of his private life I shall not speak further than to say that from no community in this state does there come concerning him that testimony of lifelong neighbors and acquaintances to his private virtues, the excellence of his morals, and the correctness of his conduct which we should like to have concerning the man who is to be made the governor of our state.

What evidence comes from his public career? He has been a member of Congress from New York City, and he owed his office to a Tammany organization and Tammany votes in a Tammany district; but he has been an absolute cipher in Congress. That is his entire public career.

He is really known to us solely as a young man, very rich by inheritance, who has become the owner of a number of sensational yellow journals; he has taken in his newspapers the popular side upon all questions relating to labor and corporations and has sustained it by much violent denunciation and many falsehoods, and he has been a persistent seeker for

office on the strength of taking the popular side; he has published whatever he thought would please the working people for the purpose of getting the labor vote. It is difficult to believe that the hard-headed, shrewd workingmen of America will give him much credit for that.

There is, however, affirmative evidence of Mr. Hearst's unfitness for the great office of governor. You will perceive that to the remedy of corporate wrongs for which he offers himself two things are necessary — first, intelligent and well-devised legislation, which shall strip from the wrongdoing corporate managers the advantage of laws made under their influence to facilitate their practices, which shall clearly prohibit their wrongful acts, and which shall provide the machinery and procedure and the necessary agencies for enforcing those laws; and, second, the judicial enforcement of the laws, which requires upright and courageous judges who will administer the laws without fear or favor, uninfluenced by wealth or popularity or personal friends or political bosses.

Underlying both of these and necessary to both, is political purity, for without that neither legislatures nor courts can be pure.

How stands Mr. Hearst's record as to political purity? Why, he comes to us covered all over with the mark of Tammany and Tammany's leader, Murphy, whom he himself has denounced as a scoundrel and a thief; he comes to us not answering to the call of the people of the state, not as the honest candidate of the Democratic party of the state, but nominated by his own procurement, through as shameful a deal with the boss of Tammany as ever disgraced a political history of the state — a deal under which a great body of the regularly elected delegates to the Democratic convention were unseated and, in their absence, the nomination of Mr. Hearst was made by the solid vote of the Tammany

delegation. Can hypocrisy go further than the willing beneficiary of Tammany Hall preaching political purity?

How stands his record as a legislator? He has had opportunity to prove his capacity and sincerity in that field. Representatives are sent to Congress to attend to the business of the country; there are hundreds of members of both parties working upon that every day of every session in the performance of their duty; the interests of the country cannot be cared for in any other way; Mr. Hearst was sent to Congress to do that; he had an opportunity then to show how much sincerity there was in all the talk of his newspapers about reforms and better government.

What did he do? Why, he did nothing; during the three years that he has been in Congress that body has been in session 467 days; there have been 185 recorded votes by yea and nay; he was present and voting at but twenty-three, and present without voting at two, leaving 160 out of the 185 roll-calls from which he was absent, and 442 out of the 467 days of legislative session when there is no evidence of his presence; his voice was heard in that Congress in those three years but once, and that was for ten minutes in a personal explanation regarding an article published in the *New York American*; he did not even contribute a motion to adjourn to the business of Congress.

He is so rich that the \$15,000 paid him for that neglected service may seem of no consequence; but no honest poor man would have thought it right to take it. Others doubtless did the work Mr. Hearst was sent to Washington to do; but it is of public interest to know that this man, who offers himself for a great public office on the strength of what he has printed in his newspaper about legislative reforms and the duties of others, totally failed to perform his own duty and proved a worthless public servant in a legislative office — the only office he has ever held.

How does he stand regarding the courts? There, indeed, if he is to be taken at his own estimate, he should be found inflexible; an independent judiciary should be his dearest hope. As to that he has had a great opportunity, for this is an exceptional year of judicial elections; ten new justices of the Supreme Court are to be elected in the city of New York. How has he used his new political power concerning them? Why, he has made another bargain with Murphy, under which Murphy has named six of them and Hearst has named four!

Six justices of the Supreme Court named by Charles F. Murphy, the boss of Tammany Hall, by agreement with William R. Hearst, the self-declared reformer. If he thus delivers the power over our courts to the man whom he declares to be a thief and a scoundrel, for the sake of getting votes for the governorship, what would he, as governor, do for the sake of getting votes for the Presidency?

His own corporate management shows the insincerity of his professions. Not only does he conduct his extensive newspaper business through corporations, but he has established separate corporations for separate newspapers and he has established a holding corporation to hold the stock of these separate corporations; and Mr. Hughes has plainly shown that he has juggled with these different incorporations to escape his just share of public taxation and to hinder and defeat the prosecution of just claims against him.

It is seldom indeed that a man so young, whose public career has been so brief, so small a portion of whose life is known at all to the public, has furnished such convincing proofs of his unsuitness for office.

But the worst of Mr. Hearst is that with his great wealth, with his great newspapers, with his army of paid agents, for his own selfish purposes, he has been day by day and year by year sowing the seeds of dissension and strife and hatred throughout our land; he would array labor against capital

and capital against labor; poverty against wealth and wealth against poverty, with bitter and vindictive feeling; he would destroy among the great mass of our people that kindly and friendly spirit, that consideration for the interests and the rights of others, that brotherhood of citizenship which are essential to the peaceful conduct of free popular government; he would destroy that respect for law, that love of order, that confidence in our free institutions which are the basis at once of true freedom and true justice.

The malignant falsehoods of these journals, read by the immigrant in his new home where none can answer them, are making him hate the people who have welcomed him to liberty and prosperity, to abundant employment, to ample wages, to education for his children, to independence for his manhood such as he has never known before.

It is not the calm and lawful redress of wrongs which he seeks, it is the turmoil of inflamed passions and the terrorism of revengeful force; he spreads the spirit, he follows the methods and he is guided by the selfish motives of the revolutionist; and he would plunge our peaceful land into the turmoil and discord of perpetual conflict, out of which the republics of South America are now happily passing.

Does any one question the justice of these statements? Then let him turn to the pages of the newspapers through the ownership of which Mr. Hearst is pressing his political fortunes.

What public servant honored by the people's trust has he not assailed with vile and vulgar epithets; what branch of our free government has he not taught his readers to believe a corrupt agency of oppression!

Listen to this from the *Journal*:

It is the sad duty of the *Journal* to announce to the people of the United States that their President, William McKinley, has deliberately tricked Congress and the country. . . .

McKinley and the Wall Street Cabinet are ready to surrender every particle of national honor and dignity.

Congress and the people of the United States have been fooled, tricked and deceived from the beginning to the end.

And to this:

The Board of Elections has already begun its disgraceful and discreditable work. It has allowed the People's petitions intrusted to its care to be marked and mutilated and destroyed. It has thrown out petitions by the score, and its action has been sustained by the courts even as the courts last year decided that you, as citizens, had no right to have your votes honestly counted, but must abide by any returns, no matter how false, of corrupt election officials.

And to this:

The effort is being made now by the criminal trusts to crush out the power of the people in the American Government. These trusts control your parties, control your primaries, control your public officers, and deny you the right to any government that will express the popular will. You are deserted and betrayed by the public officers that should sustain you, and by the so-called free press that should support you.

Joseph H. Choate, the leader of the American bar, whose honored and distinguished career is known the world over, who has been the pride of all true Americans, is stigmatized as "a servile lickspittle of corporations."

Fulton Cutting, ideal citizen, leader in philanthropy and independent politics, as a "worthless poodle."

Edward M. Shepard, the foremost advocate of civic virtue in the Democratic politics of New York City, as a "corporation lawyer."

William T. Jerome, the Democrat of independence above all others, as a "political Croton bug."

Timothy L. Woodruff, twice elected lieutenant-governor of the state, chairman of the Republican State Committee, as standing "for everything rotten in Republican politics."

Charles A. Towne, radical Congressman, as "a rat."

Richard Watson Gilder, the leader of the tenement house reform of New York, as having “no more manliness than an apple blossom.”

Thomas Taggart, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as “a plague spot in the community spreading vileness.”

Secretary Bonaparte as “a cab-horse — a snob.”

Senator Knox, the attorney-general who brought and won the suit against the Northern Securities Company, as having “Coal Trust guilt for a pillow.”

George B. McClellan, congressman, mayor of New York, and worthy heir of an honored name, as a “fraud Mayor,” “office thief,” and “the dead cat in the City Hall.”

Alton B. Parker, chief justice of the state, candidate of the Democratic party for the Presidency, as “a cockroach, a waterbug.”

John Sharp Williams, leader of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives, as “a railroad attorney.”

Joseph G. Cannon, speaker of the House of Representatives — the honest, plain, typical American, as being “as little scrupulous in politics as a fox in a barnyard.”

Charles W. Fairbanks, vice-president of the United States, as “a Wall Street speculator.”

John Hay, the great secretary of state, the cherished friend of Lincoln — noble, pure, virile American, lover of his country and his kind, whose authorship has adorned our literature and whose wise, strong statesmanship has lifted high the power and prestige of America throughout the world, is described as “a guy in a ruff and a red coat.”

To Thomas B. Reed, the great speaker of the House, he writes in a published letter: “You divide McKinley’s infamy with him and so make his load the easier. By the same token you have become a toad to the public eye; you

grow to be looked upon as a thing loathsome; your name becomes a hissing and a reproach, and your deeds a stench in the nostrils of men."

Grover Cleveland, twice president of the United States, is described as "no more or less than a living, breathing crime in breeches."

Theodore Roosevelt, president of the United States, is called "a loose-tongued demagogue," "a woman killer," "a flagrant tax dodger," "a player to the colored gallery," "a man with the caste feeling," one who "has sold himself to the devil and will live up to the bargain."

Once only has this method of incendiary abuse wrought out its natural consequence — in the murder of President McKinley. For years, by vile epithet and viler cartoons, the readers of the *Journal* were taught to believe that McKinley was a monster in human form, whose taking-off would be a service to mankind. Let me quote some of these teachings:

McKinley condones the treacherous murder of our sailors at Havana and talks of his confidence in the honor of Spain. He plays the coward and shivers white-faced at the footfall of approaching war. He makes an international cur of his country. He is an abject, weak, futile, incompetent poltroon.

McKinley, bar one girthy Princeton person, who came to be no more or less than a living, breathing crime in breeches, is therefore the most despised and hated creature in the hemisphere; his name is hooted; his figure is burned in effigy.

The bullet that pierced Goebel's chest
Cannot be found in all the West;
Good reason, it is speeding here
To stretch McKinley on his bier.

And this, in April, 1901:

Institutions, like men, will last until they die; and if bad institutions and bad men can be got rid of only by killing, then the killing must be done.

And this, in June, 1901:

There has been much assassination in the world, from the assassination of some old rulers who needed assassination to the assassination of men in

England, who, driven to steal by hunger, were caught and hanged most legally. . . .

Is there any doubt that the assassination of Marat by Charlotte Corday changed history to some extent? What proof is there that France would have settled down into imperial Napoleonism and prosperity if Marat, the wonderful eye doctor, had been allowed to live to retain his absolute mastery of the Paris populace? . . .

If Cromwell had not resolved to remove the head of Charles I from his lace collar, would England be what she is today — a really free nation and a genuine republic?

Did not the murder of Lincoln, uniting in sympathy and regret all good people in the North and South, hasten the era of American good feeling and perhaps prevent the renewal of fighting between brothers?

The murder of Caesar certainly changed the history of Europe, besides preventing that great man from ultimately displaying vanity as great as his ability.

When wise old sayings, such as that of Disraeli about assassination, are taken up it is worth while, instead of swallowing them whole, to analyze them. We invite our readers to think over this question. The time devoted to it will not be wasted.

What wonder that the weak and excitable brain of Czolgosz answered to such impulses as these! He never knew McKinley; he had no real or fancied wrongs of his own to avenge against McKinley or McKinley's government; he was answering to the lesson he had learned, that it was a service to mankind to rid the earth of a monster; and the foremost of the teachers of these lessons to him and his kind was and is William Randolph Hearst with his yellow journals.

The offense is deepened by the revolting hypocrisy which, to avert public indignation when the fatal blow had been struck and that strong and gentle spirit had departed, lauded the dead President to the skies, and said of him in the *New York Journal*:

Nowhere in the history of great men's lives, or of great men's deaths, can be found such resignation and deep religious faith as marked the last hours of William McKinley. He faced the other world and the other life with the quiet, confident hope of a man who had done his best. Slowly the heart's strength died out. It had carried him through two wars, through

many political battles, through many long days of toil, through many years of hard work and serious purpose. He began life as a simple Christian citizen. He worked hard. He interested himself in his country's welfare. He succeeded; he reached the highest place in the nation. He exercised and represented the greatest of earthly powers. He was called a second time to the highest position that men can give to any man. He ended his life as he began it — a simple Christian citizen.

Is there no one left who loved McKinley? Are there no workingmen left in New York who can not see with satisfaction honors heaped upon the man who is not guiltless of McKinley's death?

The same kind of teaching is being continued now month by month and day by day in the Hearst journals. Its legitimate consequence, if continued, must be, other weak dupes playing the rôle of Czolgosz; other McKinleys stretched upon the bier; discord and bloody strife in place of the reign of peace and order throughout our fair land. It is not the spirit of Washington and of Lincoln; it is the spirit of malice for all and charity towards none; it is the spirit of anarchy, of communism, of Kishineff and of Bielostok.

Men of New York, do you love your country? Are you not proud of your country? Are not its liberty, its justice, its equal laws, the best that weak and erring men have ever yet attained in this world? Have not those of you who have come to us from other lands found better conditions of life, better employment, better wages, greater personal independence and dignity, better opportunities for your children than ever before? Do you wish to join your voices to that which declares this freest of republics, this foremost result of government by the people, to be all vile and rotten and disgraceful?

The public knows the character of Mr. Hearst only by the newspapers he publishes, and God forbid that we should set up in the high station of governor of New York, for the admiration and imitation of our children, the man whose

character is reflected in the columns of the New York *Journal* and the New York *American*!

The immediate and necessary effect of Mr. Hearst's election would be to deprive the President of the moral support of the state of New York; it would be to strengthen the President's enemies and opponents and to weaken and embarrass him in the pursuit of his policy.

The election of this violent extremist would inevitably lead to a reaction against all true reform and genuine redress of grievances. There is no enemy of true reform so fatal as sham reform; there is no enemy of the sincere and faithful public servant who is seeking by patient and well directed effort to frame and to enforce just laws, like the selfish agitator who is seeking his own advancement; there is no ally of unscrupulous wealth so potent as the violent extremist who drives good, honest, and conservative men away from the cause of true reform by the violence of his words and the intemperance of his excessive proposals.

I beg the workingmen of New York who may hear or read my words to think upon these questions. Do you believe in President Roosevelt? Do you agree with his policy in pursuing and preventing corporate wrongdoing? Do you wish that he may be able to continue that policy with power and success? If you do, then help him by your votes.

I say to you, with his authority, that he greatly desires the election of a Republican House of Representatives to work with him in the next Congress; I say to you, with his authority, that he greatly desires the election of Mr. Hughes as governor of the state of New York; I say to you, with his authority, that he regards Mr. Hearst as wholly unfit to be governor, as an insincere, self-seeking demagogue, who is trying to deceive the workingmen of New York by false statements and false promises; and I say to you, with his authority, that he considers that Mr. Hearst's election would

be an injury and a discredit alike to honest labor and to honest capital, and a serious injury to the work in which he is engaged of enforcing just and equal laws against corporate wrongdoing.

President Roosevelt and Mr. Hearst stand as far as the poles asunder. Listen to what President Roosevelt himself has said of Mr. Hearst and his kind. In President Roosevelt's first message to Congress, in speaking of the assassin of McKinley, he spoke of him as inflamed "by the reckless utterances of those who, on the stump and in the public press, appeal to the dark and evil spirits of malice and greed, envy and sullen hatred. The wind is sowed by the men who preach such doctrines, and they cannot escape their share of responsibility for the whirlwind that is reaped. This applies alike to the deliberate demagogue, to the exploiter of sensationalism, and to the crude and foolish visionary who, for whatever reason, apologizes for crime or excites aimless discontent."

I say, by the President's authority, that in penning these words, with the horror of President McKinley's murder fresh before him, he had Mr. Hearst specifically in his mind.

And I say, by his authority, that what he thought of Mr. Hearst then he thinks of Mr. Hearst now.

THE CAMPAIGN OF 1908

ADDRESS OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE AS CHAIRMAN OF THE
REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, SARATOGA SPRINGS
NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 14, 1908

JUST a decade has passed since we were assembled in this place engaged in the business of nominating Theodore Roosevelt for governor of New York. We are now to nominate a successor to Charles E. Hughes as governor; and we are to perform that duty according to our wisdom, our loyalty to party and to country in such a way that the Empire State shall surely cast her electoral vote for the Republican candidate to succeed the same Theodore Roosevelt as president of the United States.

May we not discern in the performance of that duty an opportunity broader in its scope, more compelling in its obligation than the mere attainment of local success? May we not do our work here in such a way and in such a spirit that throughout all the country, Republicans shall be inspired with courage and hope, and every doubtful voter shall be convinced by proof that in this great representative state, the home of the candidate for vice-president, Republicans are sincere in their professions, loyal to their principles, unselfish in their patriotism, truly representative of the body of the people and worthy of the great traditions of the party of Lincoln?

We have a record which forbids discouragement or doubt in the performance of our task. We can turn to the administrations, now drawing to a close, both in the state and in the nation, and with confidence ask every American voter to say whether they have not met all the great fundamental

requisites of good government, whether they do not justify the belief that it is best for the country to keep in power the party which is responsible for them and is entitled to the credit of them. Have not these administrations within the state and in the nation been honest? Have they not been capable? Have they not been efficient? Have they not set before all the people of America examples of pure, high-minded and patriotic service in public office? Have they not raised the standard of public duty which the young men of America set for themselves? Have they not done us honor before the world?

These are the true tests by which to determine whether it is wise to continue a political party in power. It is such tests as these that we all apply in our private affairs when we select a business agent or a trustee or a lawyer or a teacher for our children. Common sense dictates their application in the selection of our agents and trustees for public business. All parties make promises before election agreeable to the ear and satisfying to the wishes of voters; but will they keep the promises? What is the evidence that they are made up of men who have the honest will, the firmness of character and the ability, without which such promises are worthless? Look to the record; see what parties have done in the past, and learn there which should be trusted for the future. Look not to petty, refined details, but to the broad question whether, taken as a whole, their wisdom, efficiency, and honesty in the past give promise of wisdom, efficiency, and honesty in the future. The answer to this question will be worth more as a guide to the voters at the coming election than all the discussion over fine-spun theories and sanguine conjectures that can be crowded into a presidential campaign.

There have been two special and notable characteristics in which these two administrations have been alike. One is that they have both gone directly to the people of the coun-

try, to the great body of the electors themselves, for their inspiration and their strength. Neither Governor nor President has relied upon that view of expediency in the conduct of public affairs which is to be gained by secret conferences in closed rooms. They have construed their representation of the people as being immediate and without intervening authority or interpreters. When they have formed opinions as to the lines of policy which it was wise to follow in the performance of their duties, they have explained their opinions directly, through the press and through public speeches, to the people who elected them, and, having got back the people's answer, they have given due weight and effect to it, in accordance with the true principles of representative government.

The second special resemblance is in a much more than ordinary vigor and sternness in the enforcement of law, which have characterized both state and national administrations. Does the constitution of the state say that no gambling shall be allowed in the state? Then it seems to the state administration a compulsory and inevitable conclusion to be forthwith acted upon with all the power of the state, that such allowance must be stopped at all hazards, no matter who is hurt or who is offended. Do the laws of the United States declare that there shall be no discrimination in railroad rates between shippers great or small? Then discriminations and rebates must be stopped by the whole aggressive force of the National Government, whatever the cost, however great and powerful may be the offenders pursued, however injurious may be their enmity. The novelty of this strenuous law enforcement has not consisted in applying any new theories of governmental control or in the exercise of any new powers, but rather in breaking up the sleepy old methods of procedure, in securing practically adequate administrative statutes to give life to the old

constitutional and statutory declarations of general rules which were by themselves ineffective, and in putting force and momentum into the attack on established and customary evils.

When continuous and widespread violations of law have been profitable and many persons have a special pecuniary interest against any interference with them, they present a degree of resistance to law enforcement which can be overcome only by an awakened public interest, and by a degree of apparent excitement which sometimes seems like undue violence, for force must be proportioned to resistance. It is impossible to burst open doors softly. An incident to this kind of vigorous law enforcement is the resentment and revengeful feeling of the people whose profits are interfered with. Of this feeling, awakened by Republican law enforcement, the Democratic party now gladly takes the benefit, and one of the serious questions of this campaign is to be whether the people of the country are going to permit the Republican party to suffer for having enforced the law in the state and the nation, or whether they are going to back up law enforcement by their approval shown in their votes for the Republican candidates.

In every department of the National Government since the decisive approval of Republican administration given in the great majorities four years ago, there has been practical effectiveness of action which should be highly satisfactory to all the people of the country who really care about having the government business well and creditably done.

The financial panic of last autumn which resulted, as so many panics have before, from reckless extravagance and wild speculation, was checked by the firm hand and clear understanding of national financial administration. Confidence was restored. The panic has passed away, revealing a substantial business soundness and widely diffused wealth

throughout the country, unprecedented in our history and the result of a long period of wise and able Republican administration; and the Republican Congress, against much Democratic opposition, has enacted a wise law to make such a panic as that impossible in the future.

Our War Department has continued to be an agent for peace and for the spread of American ideals of ordered liberty. The Filipinos, already initiated by us in the practice of local self-government in their *barrios* and provinces, have now been taught the first step towards national self-government by the successful inauguration of the Philippine Legislative Assembly.

Cuba has been pacified. Her armies, on the verge of bloodshed, have been induced to lay down their arms, and, under the intervening government and guidance of the United States, through perfectly peaceful and orderly elections, Cuba is about to embark in her second attempt at independent self-government.

Under the medical officers of the army the Isthmus of Panama, where pestilence had ruled for centuries and workmen died like flies, has been made healthful and safe; yellow fever has been banished, malaria has been reduced and the death rate among the thirty thousand employees engaged in the canal work has been reduced to the ordinary average level of our American cities. Under the engineer officers of the army the work of excavation and construction is progressing with a rapidity never before known upon any work in the world, and the simple continuance of the present conditions will within the next seven years crown the work by the completion of the canal, to the imperishable honor of America as a benefactor of civilization. What will happen if the American people change the administration with all the chances of incapacity, inexperience and doubtful experiment no one can forecast.

The extraordinary voyage of our battleship fleet, circum-navigating South America, to the extreme northern boundary of our western coast, across the wide Pacific to far-off New Zealand and Australia, and so along its way around the world, has evoked much discussion as to both political and naval policy. In both of these the developments of the voyage have shown that the policy of the Administration was sound and far-sighted. There is one other thing which the voyage has shown beyond peradventure; it is that there has been only sound and honest work under the Navy Department in construction, in equipment and in training. The unexampled test to which this fleet has been subjected absolutely excludes any possibility of graft or slackness or false pretense in naval administration.

The Post Office Department has increased its receipts from \$82,665,462.73 in 1897 to \$183,585,005.57 in 1907. It has increased the number of pieces handled from 5,781,002,143 in 1897 to 12,255,666,367 in 1907. It has increased the Rural Free Delivery routes from 83 in 1897 to 37,728 in 1907, and 39,270 in 1908, serving sixteen million people, while it has decreased the number of post offices from 76,945 in 1901 to 62,659 in 1907. The great increase in circulation of newspapers and magazines along the Rural Free Delivery routes, the bringing of up-to-date information about markets and improvements and current events to the farmer, the relief to the isolation of farm life, all testify to the wisdom of this beneficent Republican policy, which had its origin under President McKinley and its great development under President Roosevelt. The Post Office Department has effected a saving of nearly five millions a year by reform in the weighing of railway mails. It has almost completed the list of parcel-post conventions with the other nations of the world. It has given security of tenure to good postmasters, has reduced

the hours of labor and has increased the promptness and efficiency of the service.

The Department of Justice has borne the burden of vast and complicated litigation necessary to the legal assault upon widespread and deeply entrenched abuses defended by wealth and influence and power in many fields. By investigations and suits and prosecutions it has substantially put an end to the almost universal practice of railroad rebates. It has halted and made it plain that if allowed to continue in the same way it will inevitably end the oppressive and unfair practices through which great combinations of capital have been acquiring monopolies and crushing weaker competitors. It has compelled the land thieves and timber thieves who had fastened themselves upon the great government domains in the West to give up their plunder. By prosecutions under the penal clauses of the postal laws it has put an end to lotteries in the United States. It has conducted an effective campaign against the practice of peonage, a thin disguise under which slavery was again reappearing in certain regions of the South. Under the wise policy of recent Republican legislation it has asserted the value of American citizenship by scrutinizing for the first time in our history the proceedings in the multitude of courts which have power to grant naturalization, and by prosecuting the fraudulent practices under which, unchecked, the liberality of the United States towards the immigrant had so often been abused. By active proceedings it has given new life to the eight hour labor and contract labor provisions of the Federal statutes. It has enforced the ordinary laws and conducted the ordinary legal business of the Government faithfully and effectively.

In the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a new era has been inaugurated, of protection, preservation, and enlargement of the natural wealth of the United States.

The reclamation of the arid lands of the West by irrigation was provided for by the act of the Republican Congress of June 17, 1902, a fitting supplement to that other great Republican measure, the homestead law. Under that act more than 25,000,000 acres of desert lands are being rapidly converted into fruitful farms, without entailing the ultimate cost of a dollar to the national treasury. Twenty-five irrigation projects are under construction. On the first of January last, 1,881 miles of canals had been dug; 281 great dams and other large structures for the storage and utilization of water had been built; 42,447,000 cubic yards of earth and rock had been excavated; thirteen and a half miles of tunnels had been driven, and already, with practically all of the projects still uncompleted, eight new towns have been established and over fourteen thousand of our people have made new homes on the reclaimed land.

The forest policy of Republican administration under the Department of Agriculture has been far in advance of the general public appreciation of its importance. Over 166,000,000 acres of public forest land have been placed under the administration of the forest service, and by strict and well organized supervision are preserved from spoliation and from fire as great reservoirs of water supply for the interests of navigation, irrigation, power, and domestic use. The forests are not only preserved, but they are used for grazing where they can be grazed without injury, and for cutting the ripe timber that can be cut without injury. The cost of supervision, protection, and utilization has risen as the area set aside has increased, from \$350,000 in 1904 to \$1,790,678.79 in 1907, but the receipts from the sale of timber and grazing have risen from \$58,436.19 in 1904 to \$1,571,059.44 in 1907, so that the service is already almost self-supporting. Sixty-seven million acres of public lands underlaid by coal which under former practices would have been sold at a small

minimum price, and, too often, have been taken up by fraudulent entries as agricultural lands for the benefit of some corporation or syndicate, have been withdrawn from entry. Fifty million acres of the lands thus withdrawn have been examined and valued by the Geological Survey, and restored to public purchase as coal lands at a true and reasonable valuation. At fifteen hundred stations throughout the United States the flow of streams has been gauged and a knowledge of their flood and low stages and average discharge has been obtained through the Geological Survey. These investigations have shown where millions of wasted horsepower can be utilized, and at the same time destructive floods controlled and an equal flow of water preserved for the uses of navigation in the East and irrigation in the West.

The grazing lands of the public domain had been greatly encroached upon by the great cattle owners, and during the past five years fences unlawfully enclosing public lands have been removed from 3,518,583 acres and action has been taken to remove such enclosures from an additional 3,763,186 acres. During the past eight years over a million dollars have been collected by the Departments of the Interior and of Justice in penalties for timber trespasses. For all sorts of offenses aimed at the public domain during that period over three thousand indictments have been found; over 870 convictions have been had and over 250 prison sentences have been imposed. Within the same period 7,874 fraudulent land entries have been cancelled, restoring to public entry over 2,259,840 acres. Government initiative and Government activity in the conservation of our national resources have awakened the whole country to a sense of the wastefulness which has depleted our wealth in the past and the necessity of economy in the future.

In the meantime the Department of Agriculture is increasing the value of every acre of land by scientific researches

and experiments and practical instruction which are teaching our people to make their land more productive and to combat the enemies of animal and plant life. Careful, well organized and systematic inspection and supervision under the meat inspection law and the pure food law of 1906, have restored the credit of our meat products and are protecting our people from fraudulent and adulterated foods.

The Department of Commerce and Labor has, for the first time, established immediate and practical coöperation between the Government and the organized commercial bodies of the country. It is sifting with greater efficiency than ever before, under the recent legislation of Congress, the crowds of immigrants who come to our ports, and excluding criminals, paupers, the diseased, and contract laborers. It is bringing publicity into the workings of the great corporations. It is investigating the conditions surrounding woman and child labor in the United States. It is keeping the producers and merchants of the country constantly fully informed as to the markets and trade conditions of the entire world.

All of these Departments are performing with integrity and efficiency the vast mass of ordinary duties of government devolving upon them, those duties which are so inconspicuous and unnoticed, but so important for the welfare of the country. Search where you may, in no private business, corporate or individual, in this or any other country, can be found a higher standard of integrity, fidelity, and competency than exists today in the Government of the United States in all its Departments.

Our country has not lived unto itself alone. It is at peace with all the world, but it is not the peace of isolation. We have grown so great that we are touching elbows with the people of every other country. Our vast trade seeks every market; our millions of immigrants maintain ties of citizenship or relationship with every country; our travellers throng

every foreign highway. We could not, if we would, escape from the responsibilities, the duties and the opportunities, of active membership in the community of nations. On that great international field we must play our part, whether we will or no. We must maintain and enlarge our trade; we must protect our citizens, native and naturalized, in every right; we must establish and maintain a strength of potential defense which shall discourage predatory attacks that our wealth would otherwise invite; we must render justice to all countries and to their people, so that there shall be no just cause for assaults upon us; we must promote friendly intercourse and better knowledge between our people and all others, so that there shall be no quarrels born of misunderstanding. Beyond all this, we must do our part according to the measure of our wealth and power, to promote the peace of the world, to encourage and to aid the weak, the unfortunate and the undeveloped peoples of mankind along the pathway of civilization, and to spread throughout the world the ordered liberty and justice which has been our heritage.

In these things we have not failed. In the second great Peace Conference at The Hague the American representatives bore their part of useful service with distinction, and contributed in full measure to the results of the Conference, which constitute one of the greatest advances ever made towards the reasonable and peaceable regulation of international conduct. Twelve treaties agreed upon at that Conference all designed to reduce the probability or mitigate the horrors of war have been approved by the Senate and ratified by the President.

Following the Conference, the United States has put itself definitely upon the basis of the peaceful settlement of international disputes by concluding general treaties of arbitration with England, France, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Italy, Mexico, and

Japan. All of these have been confirmed by the Senate, and many others are in course of negotiation.

Threatened tariff wars between the United States and Germany and the United States and France have been averted by commercial agreements under the power conferred upon the President in the third section of the Dingley tariff act.

The long unsettled questions with Canada have been carried far along the way towards a conclusion. Under one treaty already made a commission is disposing of the last remaining questions of doubt and dispute along our three thousand miles of boundary. Under another treaty a commission is framing joint international regulations for the preservation of the food supply in the Great Lakes and other boundary waters. Under a third treaty we have agreed upon the submission to The Hague Tribunal of the century-old controversies relating to the Newfoundland fisheries, while pending this arbitration, from year to year, our fishermen are protected in their rights by a friendly *modus vivendi*.

In China the boycott against American goods caused by Chinese exclusion has been abandoned, and China is herself giving valuable aid towards preventing the emigration of her coolies to America. Under authority of Congress we are about remitting all the punitive part of the indemnity stipulated for after the Boxer rebellion, and the Chinese Government is of its own motion formulating a plan to apply the remitted part of the indemnity to the sending of Chinese students annually to be educated in the United States.

All the wild outeries of the sensational press at home and abroad have failed to destroy the good understanding between the Governments of Japan and of the United States. The difficulties which arose in San Francisco have been disposed of. The two Governments are actively coöoperating with perfect mutual understanding for the prevention of

Japanese labor immigration into the United States. Our treaty of arbitration ratified during the past summer was followed by a treaty for the mutual protection of trade marks, copyrights and patents in China. On the special invitation of Japan we are making preparations to participate on a scale which we have never before attempted, in her great international exposition which is to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the accession of her Emperor; and upon the special invitation of Japan our fleet is about to visit the harbor of Tokyo where it will be received with a hospitality not marred by a single discordant note.

Our course in the Pan American Conference at Rio de Janeiro in 1906 and the friendly intercourse which has followed have dispelled the suspicion and distrust with which we were once regarded by the people of Latin America, and with the single exception of the irresponsible and abnormal dictator of Venezuela, genuine friendship and good-will bridge the gulf of race and language between ourselves and every people of the western hemisphere.

Regarding the countries about the Caribbean Sea, whose nearness to the Panama canal route makes their fortunes of special interest to us, we have developed and followed a definite course of policy which may be described by saying, "We do not wish to take possession of any of those countries ourselves; we are not willing to have any other foreign nation take possession of them; and to prevent the necessity of the one or the possibility of the other, we do wish to help them govern themselves in peace and order and prosperity."

That is the key to our treatment of Cuba. Under that policy we have made a treaty with San Domingo under which the presence of a single American civil officer, as receiver of customs, with the moral power of the United States behind him to demonstrate the hopelessness of any attempt at revolution, has substituted uninterrupted peace

for continuous turmoil and bloodshed, has more than doubled the Government revenues, has brought about an adjustment of the debt and a restoration of solvency, and has established a revival of industry and of commerce. Under the same policy we have been collaborating with Mexico, once an enemy and now a close and valued friend, to mitigate the conditions of revolution and war among the Central American states; and a peace conference during the past winter, under the guidance of the two greater countries, has resulted in a series of treaties and the establishment of an international Central American court for the settlement of differences — substantial advances along the slow and difficult pathway to established order.

In the meantime the reorganization of our consular service and the practice of promotion for merit in the diplomatic service has increased the efficiency and usefulness of all our representatives abroad. We contributed substantially towards maintaining the peace of Europe in the Conference at Algeciras, and the greatest war of modern times was ended when Japan and Russia were brought together under the congenial influence of American conciliation in the Treaty of Portsmouth.

The prosperity and well-being of our people as a whole correspond to the efficiency of the Government, which justly represents them. Never anywhere in the long history of mankind's struggles for better conditions, has there been among so many millions of people so great a diffusion of wealth, such universal comfort of living, such ready rewards for industry and enterprise, such unlimited opportunities for education and individual advancement and such independence and dignity of manhood as in our country now.

We are all familiar with the amazing statistics that mark our prosperity. Our foreign trade last year amounted to \$3,315,272,503. The balance of trade in our favor last year

was \$446,429,653, and in the last four years it has amounted to \$1,825,520,202. The value of our farm products last year was \$3,958,000,000. According to the last census there were 5,739,657 separate farms, and the live stock upon those farms is valued at \$4,331,230,000. The value of our manufactured products in 1905 amounted to \$16,866,703,985. Our bank deposits of all kinds last year amounted to \$13,077,-330,466. There were last year in the United States 8,588,-811 savings bank depositors, with an aggregate deposit of \$3,495,410,087. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, there were instructed in the schools of the United States 18,434,847 scholars, and of these 210,333 were students in universities, colleges, professional and technical schools. Churches and hospitals and libraries abound. Associations for mutual aid and for public benefit number their members and their revenues by millions. Our people are keenly alive to the public interest and competent for the discussion of public questions. Expression of opinion is free as the air we breathe. Respect for law is general; disregard of it is the rare exception. At no time and in no country has mere wealth secured for its possessor less public consideration or have the high qualities of personal manhood availed so much for honor and opportunity.

Government did not make these conditions, but they would have been impossible without wise and good government, and wise and good government is necessary to their continuance. Let us all put our shoulders to the wheel of reform. Let us press along in the path of progress, constantly improving conditions and leaving no class or condition of men who do not share in the improvement; but let us not forget that true reform proceeds, not by overturning or destroying in order to substitute the conjectural future of sanguine theory, but always by building steadily and surely on the safe foundations of all that is good in the present.

Wisdom, skill, experience in the operations of government, practical capacity combined with honest purpose are necessary to make true reform effective. Without these, declarations and public speeches, however eloquent, and proposals, however attractive, are mere words and will never be realized. The substantial question for the voters to answer in November is, how shall we secure a continuance of the good government under which we have attained to all our blessings; how select public agents who will maintain the peace and order and prosperity we now have; and at the same time press forward and make practically effective the reforms which this Republican Administration has inaugurated, and upon the value and beneficence of which all parties are agreed.

Plainly the true successor to this great duty is Secretary Taft. His wise experience and long years of successful service under heavy responsibilities as jurist, legislator, administrator, his intimate acquaintance with the public affairs of our country, internal and external, prove his wisdom, his skill, and his capacity. The confidence and sympathy and intimate association with which he has stood by and aided President Roosevelt in every stage of the policies which by the common consent of both parties now lie before us to be continued and developed in practical effectiveness, indicate him as the best possible man to continue those policies. The character that we know so well, with its courage, firmness, and energy, its unselfishness, modesty, frankness, and honor assures us of his honest purpose and his eminent fitness for the greatest of offices.

The Democratic party announces as the issue of this campaign upon which it asks the voters of the country to take the powers of administration and legislation away from the party that has thus proved its competency, and to embark upon the experiment of Democratic control — as “the overshadowing issue” the question “Shall the people rule?”

Do not the people rule ? This is a representative government. It surely is not proposed to do away with representation and have eighty-five millions of people make and execute their laws directly, without the intervention of legislative and executive agents. Are not the laws being made and executed by the agents whom the people have selected for that purpose ? I find that by the lawful returns of the last presidential election Theodore Roosevelt received 2,541,296 more votes for the Presidency than Alton B. Parker. Has he not a good title to the office ? Are not the people ruling through him, their chosen Executive, so far as his part of the government is concerned ? Has not every congressional district been represented in Congress by the man whom a majority of its voters selected ? Is not every state represented in the Senate by Senators chosen by its own legislature, selected by the people of the state for the performance of that very duty ?

But Mr. Bryan gives specifications. He says there are three reasons why the people do not rule.

First, because there is corrupt use of money at elections. Does he mean to say that the two millions and a half of votes which constituted Mr. Roosevelt's majority were bought; that to such a frightful extent the American electorate is venal ? Does he produce any evidence of such a charge ? Not the slightest. Does he produce any facts tending to sustain even a suspicion of the justice of such a charge ? None whatever. For one, I deny its truth, and I assert that American elections are fair and honest elections, and that the Government in Washington has been wielding the powers vested in it under the Constitution by the clear and unquestionable will of the people of the United States. Campaign funds were raised and used in the last election by both parties, as they ought to have been raised and used. Mr. Bryan's managers are appealing for contributions of campaign funds

today. The universal and intelligent discussion of great questions of public policy by the American people during a presidential campaign is the most useful and the most hope-inspiring school of government in the world. It is that which makes the people ever more competent to govern justly and wisely. No money expended to promote that great exercise of governing intelligence is ill-spent; and to furnish eighty-five million people with material for discussion, to reach them with information and argument and refutation of argument, and appeals, through public speech and through the mails and private canvass, requires organization, the labor of thousands of men and the expenditure of great sums. The repetition of small expenses among a great multitude of people spread over a vast territory mounts up with a rapidity difficult to realize. The postage on a single letter mailed to each of the fourteen million voters of the country amounts to \$280,000. To such proper and useful purposes and to such purposes only was the Republican campaign fund of the last election devoted.

The second reason why Mr. Bryan says the people do not rule is that we have not direct election of Senators, and he holds the Republican party responsible for not having procured an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for that. There is no more necessity for an amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct election of Senators than there is for an amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct election of President. If the people of any state wish any particular man to be chosen as Senator, they have only to instruct their legislature, as the people of a considerable number of states make it their practice to do now, and no legislature will ever for a moment think of disobeying the instructions any more than presidential electors violate their obligations. The proposed amendment is simply to enable the people of each state to

escape from the performance of the duty of electing a legislature that can be trusted. Are we prepared to abandon the performance of that duty? Are we to assume that our state legislatures must necessarily and for all time be unfit to represent the people of the state? If so, what becomes of the government of the state? Is that with all its multitude of important duties to be left unfit? If any state legislature cannot now be trusted, the true reform would seem to be in the direction of selecting the legislature.

Speaking for myself alone, I believe that the selection of legislative candidates by direct primaries would be a material improvement, and would greatly increase the sense of immediate responsibility to their constituents on the part of the members of the state legislatures. In such primaries the voters could instruct their candidates if they saw fit and as they saw fit, regarding the selection of Senators. But that is a question the people of each state can settle for themselves without any amendment of the Constitution, and however they settle it, they rule in the way they prefer to rule. If any legislature under the Constitution does not choose a Senator who properly represents the people of the state, it is because the people of the state have failed in their duty in the selection of their legislature. Let them perform their duty under the Constitution as it is, rather than claim for an amendment to the Constitution to enable them to escape that duty. In the long run, to secure good government we must ultimately come down to the faithful performance of duty by the people of the country at the polls, and no expedient or change of form will take the place of that performance.

The third reason why the people do not rule, says Mr. Bryan, is to be found in the rules of the House of Representatives. The Denver convention declared in its platform that it "observed with amazement the popular branch of our Federal Government helpless to obtain either the considera-

tion or enactment of measures desired by a majority of its members." Who makes the rules of the House of Representatives? Why, a majority of its members, and a majority can change them as it will. Manifestly, there must be rules to control the conduct of the business of the House, or no business could be done. Over thirty thousand bills were introduced in the last session of Congress, and there are three hundred and eighty-six members. If one-tenth of the members had attempted to speak five minutes each on one-tenth of the bills that were introduced, working eight hours a day for the average legislative session and permitting the transaction of no other business, they would have been speaking still, and the term of office of the entire Congress would expire before one-fourth of the one-tenth could be heard. Plainly there must be rules to limit oratory, to provide for the selection of the measures which shall come up for discussion, and to provide for the transaction of the real business of legislation. All legislative bodies have to adopt such rules, and the larger the body the more necessary are the rules and the more stringent they have to be. It is an invariable incident to the transaction of all legislative business that from time to time members who are not allowed to talk as long and as often as they please to the exclusion of others, and who cannot have the measure they are particularly interested in acted upon in preference to other measures, rise up and cry out against the rules, as the Democrats are crying out against them now. The real trouble is that the Democrats in the House of Representatives are a minority and cannot have their own way because they are a minority. The real Democratic grievance is, not that the majority does not rule, but that it does rule. The rules at present in force in the House of Representatives are those adopted under Speaker Reed when the Democratic members of the House had stopped all public business by refusing to answer to their names and insisting that unless

they answered, although personally present, they could not be counted as making up a quorum. The amazement with which the Democratic party observes that those rules are still in force must be greatly increased by the knowledge of the fact that the same rules were continued and enforced by the Democratic House under the Democratic speaker, Mr. Crisp, when they succeeded to the Republican House over which Mr. Reed presided.

Consideration of the paramount issue now proposed by the Democracy, "Shall the people rule?", forces the conclusion that the draftsmen of the Democratic platform are to be acquitted of the offense of insulting the intelligence of the American people by a piece of cheap buncombe, only because they have fallen into the confusion which beset the three tailors of Tooley Street, who began their proclamation "We the people of England", and that they think the people do not rule because they do not themselves rule.

The Democratic platform assails the Republican National Administration for the increase in the number of office-holders and the great expenditures of the Government, which the platform characterizes as extravagant. It demands that the National Government shall do a great variety of things which can be done only through the employment of numerous agents and the expenditure of great sums of money, but it declares the employment of the agents and the expenditure of the money to be unjustifiable and extravagant. It gives specifically the number of office-holders added and the number of million dollars expended, but is silent as to the work that has been accomplished. In the numbers so given by the Democratic platform are included the carriers who deliver the mails upon the thirty-nine thousand rural free delivery routes. Would the Democratic party discharge them from office and stop the rural free delivery? If not, is it honest for its platform to invite the condemnation of the people for

the addition of these thirty-nine thousand letter-carriers without disclosing what they were for? The increase of expense which it declares to be extravagant includes the cost of the Panama Canal. Would it stop work on the Canal? If not, is it honest to include that cost in the figures of added expense which it calls extravagance and not disclose the purpose for which the expense was added? The employment of agents and the expenditure of money made necessary in the prosecution of trusts, the regulation of railroads, the prevention of rebates, the restoration of public lands, the conservation of natural resources, the regulation of immigration and of naturalization, the improvement of agriculture, the upbuilding of the navy, the extension of our foreign trade, all the vast activities of the National Government along the very lines that the Democratic party is insisting upon, are included in these figures which the Democratic platform charges as extravagance without one word to indicate what is the fact, that full and necessary service was rendered by every additional officer and full value received for every dollar. The expenditures of the present Republican Administration have been well within the means of the country, and there remains to it in the Treasury a surplus of revenues collected during this Administration over and above the expenditures. Every additional office-holder employed and every dollar of increase of expenditure have been authorized by the direct representatives of the people of the United States in Congress as being wise expenditure in the public interest. Every dollar has been honestly expended in accordance with that authority, and in charging extravagance by a mere statement of the amount expended and the number of officers employed, without any reference to what was accomplished, the Democratic party must stand convicted of an attempt to mislead the people of the United States by the mere force of large figures.

The Democratic platform charges also that the action of the present Chief Executive in using the patronage of his high office to secure the nomination of Mr. Taft to the Presidency is "a violation of the spirit of our institutions." Is there a man of full age in the United States who does not know that the power which Mr. Roosevelt brought to the support of Mr. Taft's candidacy was not patronage but his extraordinary and phenomenal popularity and leadership among the masses of the people of the country, a popularity of which Mr. Bryan is now attempting to secure the benefit by declaring himself Mr. Roosevelt's natural successor? Is there one who does not know that if Mr. Roosevelt had desired to perpetuate his power, he could have been nominated by raising his finger, and that his advocacy of Mr. Taft's nomination was because it was necessary for him to secure the nomination of some one in order to prevent his own nomination? Is there one who does not believe in his heart of hearts that the selection of Mr. Taft by Mr. Roosevelt as his candidate for the Presidency at the very moment when he himself was thrusting aside the Presidency, was with the honest purpose to secure the best possible administrator of the great policies that were dear to his heart? Is it to a dishonest purpose that Mr. Bryan claims to be the heir, and is it possible to ascribe a desire to perpetuate personal power to the man who held the highest power in his grasp and rejected it?

It is but a short time since these same voices of detraction were charging the President with the purpose of usurping supreme and perpetual authority for himself. Yet he has proved himself capable of a renunciation of power exceptional in history, and has contributed to our system of government a precedent which forever sets a limit upon the continuance of the presidential office. It is but a short time since these same voices were heard declaring that the Presi-

dent's character was so rashly belligerent that his Presidency would involve the country in certain war. Yet he has proved to be the greatest peacemaker of his generation.

Mr. Bryan charges that the Republican party is responsible for the abuses of corporate wealth. As well might he charge that the man who plants cotton is responsible for the boll weevil, or that the man who plants fruit trees is responsible for the San José scale. Until the millennium has brought the eradication of human selfishness and greed, social abuses will come according to the shifting conditions of the times. Adversity and prosperity, wealth and poverty have each their own kinds of abuse. Constant vigilance and constant activity to meet and put an end to abuses as they arise is the task of government and of good citizenship; but the work is never finished. The Republican party has produced the conditions which have made our great prosperity possible, and it is dealing with the evils which have been incident to that prosperity with vigor and effectiveness.

There are two substantial proposals made by the Democratic party as to the policy which it will follow if it is brought into power.

One is that it will wipe out the protective tariff and substitute a tariff for revenue only. I shall not discuss that proposition, but it ought not to be forgotten. The eleven years which have passed since the Dingley tariff was enacted have brought about many changes in the conditions to which the tariff law is applied. Many of these changes have resulted from the very prosperity which the protection afforded by the tariff has produced. In the nature of things, such changes must occur, and from time to time every tariff must be revised and adapted to the new conditions. As the period of revision, however, is always one of uncertainty and a consequent injury to business, revisions ought not to be made too often, or upon slight grounds. The Republican

party has not considered that sufficient grounds for thus disturbing business have existed heretofore. It considers that sufficient grounds do now exist and it has pledged itself immediately after the fourth of March next to devote an extraordinary session of Congress to making such a revision in accordance with the true principles of protection. One of the questions that must be determined by the coming election is whether we shall have such a revision, or whether we shall have the principle of protection abandoned and a new tariff enacted in accordance with the principles of free trade, and containing only such duties as are necessary to raise revenue for the support of the Government without any protective purpose.

The last time the Democratic party was in power it attempted such a change of policy and the result was the Wilson-Gorman tariff of 1893. The very threat of such a proceeding at that time stopped business, closed the mills, threw millions of men out of employment and was accompanied by universal business depression and disaster. Are we ready to repeat that experience now, as we surely shall if we put the Democratic party in power?

The other proposition of the Democratic platform is to require all national banks to guarantee the payment of deposits by all other national banks. This is another patent financial nostrum, advertised to catch the fancy of the multitude; and it should be suppressed under the pure food law until it is correctly labelled, "a measure to compel legitimate business to bear the risks of speculation." It might well be called a measure to destroy the national banking system, for who will wish to invest his money in a business where it is not merely subject to the risks assumed by the men whom he and his associates select to manage it, but is subject also to be called upon for the payment of an unlimited amount of debts of an indefinite number of persons over whom and

whose obligations he and his associates have no control whatever?

A bank deposit is a very simple business transaction. The depositor in effect loans his money to the bank, which borrows it upon a promise to repay it on the lender's order, with or without a stipulated interest. Banks seldom fail to pay the debts thus contracted. Although the deposits are ordinarily many times the capital, losses are exceedingly small. The principal reason why this is so is that bankers are ordinarily men who have established a good reputation in the community for honesty and business sense. People ordinarily will not risk their money by lending it to men who have not these claims to confidence. Under the law any one who can furnish \$25,000 can start a bank, but in practice, as a rule no one can start a bank who cannot also furnish a character which leads the community to trust him and deposit their money with him. If, however, the sound and honest banks of the country guarantee the debts of every bank, a well earned reputation for honesty and business judgment will no longer be necessary as a part of the banker's capital. It will no longer be necessary for the community to consider whether a banker is honest or not. Any scalawag can start a bank and obtain deposits on the credit of all the banks of the country. Any one who wishes to use funds in speculative enterprises can start a bank, invite deposits and thus borrow money on the credit of the entire banking capital of the United States. With such opportunities who can doubt that the standard of character of the bankers of the country would deteriorate and the use of banking funds for speculative enterprises would increase and that the losses which the honest bankers would be required to make good would increase correspondingly?

This burden would fall not merely upon the stockholders of the banks, but upon the depositors also. Much banking

capital would inevitably be driven out of the business and such as remained would have to make good its losses by reducing the rate of interest to its depositors and increasing the rate of interest upon loans. The profits of the banking business, like those of the merchant, the manufacturer, and the farmer, depend upon good management. The attempt to make all the profits of good management bear all the losses of bad management is a step in the socialistic process which would level all distinctions between thrift, enterprise, and sound judgment on the one hand, and recklessness, incapacity, and failure on the other.

Except for campaign purposes there is no occasion for any such scheme. The business men of the country need no guarantee of bank deposits. They know with whom they are dealing when they select a bank for deposits, and their intelligence and knowledge of affairs are amply sufficient for their own protection in making the selection. The wage-earners of the country, the multitude of people of small savings, not familiar with business, so far as they live in places where there are savings banks, have practically perfect safety for their deposits, and over eight and a half millions of them are enjoying that safety now with a good rate of interest. For them if they prefer it, and for all those who live in places which are not accessible to savings banks, the Republican party proposes that the Government shall furnish absolute security through a postal savings bank, so that the wage-earner can deposit his savings at the nearest post-office and have the guarantee of the Government that it shall be returned; but that guarantee will be accompanied by the possession and control of the money itself, so that neither the depositor nor the Government can lose. This simple supplement to the banking and savings bank system meets every requirement, and, unlike the Democratic proposal, it has been proved safe and practicable by the experience of many

countries and it violates no principle of sound finance or of common sense.

What evidence of Democratic fitness to be entrusted with power is to be found in the record of its candidate for the Presidency ? It is with profound satisfaction that we recognize the purity and uprightness of Mr. Bryan's character, and we cannot withhold our admiration from the skill and attractiveness of his oratory; but when a candidate for high office can furnish no evidence of fitness derived from the actual performance of official duty, and relies entirely upon what he proposes to do in the future, we must test, so far as we can, the soundness of his judgment by the substance of his proposals, not by his manner of presenting them. It was skillful for Mr. Bryan to say that he is bound by the omissions of the Democratic platform as well as by what it contains; but who dictated the omissions as well as the platform ? Can an omission of today wipe out public utterances of the past and remove them from memory as a basis for judgment upon the public man ? The same eloquent voice which now with so much confidence is telling us how the Government ought to be conducted was heard in Mr. Bryan's candidacy of 1896 urging upon the American people as the panacea for all evils and an absolute necessity for our prosperity, the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. Was he right then ? Was his judgment sound then ? Would it have been wise for the people of the country to elect him President then in order to carry out the policy to which he was then devoted ?

With the same confidence during his second candidacy he was heard to declare that the paramount issue before the American people was that of imperialism. Where is that issue now ? However tired some Americans may be of the burden of the Philippines, what must be our estimate of the political wisdom and sense of proportion for which

in the year 1900 the so-called question of imperialism filled the horizon and obscured the sky as the one paramount issue before the American people?

On August 30, 1906, Mr. Bryan announced upon his return from Europe, as the result of deliberate reflection, that government ownership of railroads was the cure-all demanded by the public interest. "I have reached the conclusion," he declared, "that there will be no permanent relief on the railroad question from the discrimination between individuals and between places and from extortionate rates until the railroads are the property of the Government and are operated by the Government in the interest of the people." That declaration he has repeated many times in substance.

The Republican party believes in the regulation of railroads. It believes that their managers ought to be made and can be made to obey the law. It believes that by an enforcement of the law, not spasmodic and sensational, but steady, firm and persistent, excessive and discriminating rates can be stopped; and it is now and has been for a considerable period engaged in such enforcement with marked efficiency and success. It proposes for the Presidency a candidate who declares his purpose to continue and complete that enforcement of the law and whose competency to do so with success has been proved. Mr. Bryan does not believe in the regulation of railroads. He does not believe it practicable. He regards it as bound to fail, although he is willing to criticize the Republican party for not accomplishing that vast and complicated task all at once.

It is natural to observe that if the people of the country desire railroads to be regulated, and the laws regarding them to be enforced, it would be wise to entrust that regulation to Mr. Taft, who believes in regulation and has faith in the wisdom and effectiveness of the law, rather than to the hands of one who believes that all effort to regulate must prove futile.

The chief importance of this subject, however, rests in the light it throws upon the candidate's qualification for the presidential office. It is an essential characteristic of our system of government that it aims to afford individual opportunity for enterprise rather than to exercise paternal control. Americans have all felt from the earliest times that undue extension of governmental power threatened liberty and tended to dull the initiative which has made us great as a nation. It has been only upon the most long continued consideration and with many doubts that we have yielded step by step to the enlargements of governmental regulation made necessary by the increasing complications of modern life and business. The apostle of the doctrine that the functions of government should be confined within the narrowest possible limits was Thomas Jefferson, whose disciple Mr. Bryan today professes to be. Under his inspiration the true Democratic party continually resisted the extension of governmental functions. It opposed the use of government moneys for internal improvements. It opposed the building of the Pacific railroads. It opposed the National Bank act. It denied the right of the National Government to impose a protective tariff. It has steadfastly maintained the broadest construction of state rights and the narrowest construction of national rights. Yet Mr. Bryan, while inscribing the name of Thomas Jefferson upon his standard, seriously proposes that the Federal Government shall not merely regulate the operations of railroads which are engaged in interstate commerce, but shall acquire and own and operate itself all the great railroads of the country. Consider for a moment the situation which would exist in the state of New York with the Federal Government owning and Federal officers in Washington controlling with all the rights of ownership the New York & New Haven, the New York Central, the West Shore, the Ontario & Western, the Delaware & Hudson, the

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, the Erie, the Lehigh Valley, the Baltimore & Ohio, and the Pennsylvania railroads. Consider the situation in Illinois with the Government controlling all the railroads that concentrate in Chicago; in Missouri the railroads that center in St. Louis. Add to that Mr. Bryan's proposal that no great interstate business shall be transacted — and all great business is interstate business — without the permission of the Federal Government evidenced by a license; and you cannot fail to realize that he is prepared to see the state dwarfed into insignificance, and the farmer, the miner, the manufacturer, the merchant, all individual enterprise, not merely subject to restraint against wrongdoing, but dependent upon the Government, and upon a centralized Government at Washington for their very existence. That is not reform: it is revolution. It is reversion to the ideas of paternal government from which America had happily escaped with her system of free individual opportunity and enterprise and to the ideas out of which South America has been bravely struggling for a generation. And this is to be done in the name of Thomas Jefferson!

Now Mr. Bryan proposes that under supervision of the National Government everybody shall provide for the payment of everybody else's debts by his bank deposit guaranty scheme.

Is it prudent to place in his hands the great power of the Presidency; and above all is it wise to give to him rather than to Mr. Taft, the experienced judge, the filling of the four vacancies in the Supreme Court of the United States which may be expected during the next Administration?

What is furnished by the record of the Democratic party at large to show that it is competent to maintain the prosperity we have, and execute the promises of reform it tenders? No proof whatever of that is offered. All the evidence we have is the other way. The majority of us have not yet for-

gotten the second administration of Grover Cleveland, which ended only on March 4, 1897. The Democracy then had its opportunity to show the world what it could do with government, for it possessed the Executive office, a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House. Its opportunity to exercise that control for the public benefit was wasted. Discord and confusion reigned throughout the entire four years. Incapacity to reach practical conclusions or to take any effective action was demonstrated. No promises were kept. No reforms were accomplished. It became apparent that the sole cohesive force that bound the Democratic party together was the desire for office, and once in office, instead of progress, we had all factions pulling different ways, totally incapable of agreeing upon a common course of conduct. There was but one sentiment in which a majority of the Democratic majority could be united; that was in hatred of Mr. Cleveland, and they hated him for his virtues. His sturdy integrity and high courage, his sincere convictions and patriotic purpose, his experience in government and strong practical sense afforded a leadership under which a party capable of government could have done great things for the country. The Democratic party repudiated his leadership, and the very men who now control that party followed him to his grave with depreciation and detraction. Under that discordant Democracy the country drifted through years of commercial depression and disaster, poverty and distress, without effective government, until the first election of McKinley and a Republican Congress placed the reins of power in the hands of a party competent to govern.

Are the people of the United States ready to repeat that experience of Democratic government ?

THE NEW YORK STATE CAMPAIGN OF 1910

ADDRESS AT THE MANHATTAN CASINO, NEW YORK,
OCTOBER 28, 1910

IT often happens that the result of an election depends upon what issues different voters think their votes will decide, many voting on one issue and many others voting upon another issue, with the result that nothing is decided except who shall hold office. The consequences of such an election are apt to be very different from anything a majority of the voters really desire.

A good many Republicans at this time seem disposed to go a step farther and to ignore all the grave and substantial issues which are before the people of this state and to vote at the coming election upon no issue whatever but simply as an expression of feeling against Mr. Roosevelt, whose course regarding national affairs they disapprove for one reason or another, and whom they desire to punish by defeating the party to which they belong, in which they believe, and which they have long loyally supported, because he holds a distinguished and potent place in the councils and the activities of the party.

It should be observed that the declaration of this intention cuts both ways. Wherever a man declares he will vote against the Republican ticket because he does not like Roosevelt there will be others who will vote for the ticket because they do like Roosevelt and because they feel that with his tremendous force and courage and ability, he has done a noble and much needed work for honesty, purity, equality, and freedom in the political life of our country. My guess

would be that if the issue in this state were whether Mr. Roosevelt has reflected credit and honor upon the Republican party, on our state, and on our country, or the contrary, there would be a very large majority in the affirmative. I am not, however, going to discuss that question or to discuss him, for there is no such issue before the people of this state. The false assumption that there is such an issue tends to take away from the cause of honest and effective and progressively improving government in this state many of the supporters to whom that cause is entitled, and among them some of my old and valued friends.

It is said that we must consider now the nomination for the Presidency in 1912. Well, Mr. Taft is President of the United States; a Republican President; a strong, wise, considerate, and fearless man. He has the qualities which make a man grow in the estimation of thoughtful people, and, lying back of all the clamor and excitement of our political life, the American people are a thoughtful people. He has grown and is growing and will continue to grow in public esteem. If he continues to make as good a President as he is making now he will be the natural and inevitable candidate of his party in 1912 unless one thing shall happen -- that the people of the United States shall repudiate the administration of Mr. Taft by such a crushing and overwhelming defeat of his party that it will be apparent that Mr. Taft cannot be re-elected. The Democratic party cannot bring about such a result, but Republicans can by their adverse votes. After re-election people don't scrutinize the multitude of reasons which may have contributed to the result. They see only the general result, and if it should happen that the Administration cannot hold its own party together the national convention would be quite likely to look for a Moses to lead them out of the wilderness, and they might go to Mr. Roosevelt or they might go to one of the far more radical leaders who are

now looming up on the political horizon in the North and Middle West. Make no mistake, my friends: so far as this election in the state of New York bears any relation to national affairs, Republican votes for the Republican ticket strengthen the Administration in the party, and Republican votes against the ticket tend to weaken and break down the Administration. No one understands this better than Mr. Roosevelt. No one knows better than he that the strenuous efforts he is making in behalf of Republican candidates, not merely in New York but in a dozen other states, are services in aid of the Taft administration and tend towards the renomination of Mr. Taft in 1912.

It is said that to have Mr. Stimson in the governor's chair would promote Mr. Roosevelt's political fortune. The people who say this do not mean what is undoubtedly true, that he will be such a governor as to reflect credit on every one who has supported him. In any other sense the proposition is based on an entire misunderstanding of the man. Mr. Stimson is not the kind of man who will be successful politically in distributing patronage and manipulating caucuses and delegates and conventions for or against any one. He would make a miserable failure if he tried it. He is a very strong, able man with exceptional independence and decision of character, perfectly fearless, absolutely upright, and with an intelligence of great natural vigor, thoroughly trained and guided by a genuine public spirit. He was selected as the candidate because he had done some things in public office which show what kind of man he is and which ought to be a guaranty to the people of the state that he is the kind of man they need for governor. No man can use him and no man can make a stepping-stone of him. He is as big and strong a man at forty-three as Taft or Roosevelt was at that age. He runs in that class. He is of the quality of which great public servants are made, and no matter how the vote goes next

month, modest, unassuming, and unselfish as he is, a great career awaits him because he is such a man as the people greatly need.

It is said we should consider in our votes at this election certain declarations Mr. Roosevelt has made — an attack on the courts, and something called New Nationalism.

With due respect to the people who are talking in this way, I venture to assert that if three months hence they will look back at their utterances they will themselves see that this is arrant nonsense. There is a very old American saying that when a litigant does not like a decision it is his privilege to go down to the tavern and swear at the court. Everybody grumbles about decisions that he does not like, and Mr. Roosevelt appears to have done so out loud and in public, according to his temperament and habits. But I have never known the grumbling at decisions of the courts by people who do not like them to do any harm, and the idea that Mr. Roosevelt contemplates an attack upon our judicial system, or that that system is in danger from him or from any one else, is purely fanciful and devised for campaign purposes only.

As for myself, I regard the power of the judicial branch of our government, both in the state and in the nation, to sit in judgment upon the constitutionality of legislative and executive acts, as the chief contribution of America to the art of self-government. The power of the courts to declare unlawful and void the acts of legislatures and executives when those acts do not conform to the great rules of right action embodied in our constitution, is the chief guaranty of permanency in our institutions. It is the chief guaranty that our liberty shall be enjoyed without violating justice, and that justice shall be administered without destroying liberty. If the existence or exercise of that power by the courts in its full scope and authority were attacked, I should do my

utmost, as I know you would do your utmost, to repel the attack and to maintain the dignity and the power and the permanence of our judicial system.

The overwhelming mass of the American people feel the same way. Nobody really has the slightest idea of making Congress and the state legislatures superior to the Constitution, as they would be if the power of the courts to pass upon their acts were taken away. All this talk about an attack upon the courts and danger to the courts is mere idle campaigning and pretense.

What is New Nationalism? What is there beneath the phrase of new political or constitutional doctrine? There may be something that I have not heard of, but I have been able to find nothing in it that was not taught in my class in the law school forty odd years ago; that has not been written large in the text-books on the Constitution since Marshall's time; that has not been part of the generally accepted belief of the American people for generations. I can see that some of the old doctrines that we have professed, we have grown lax and indifferent in applying; that some of the ideals to which we have done lip service and pen service, we have ignored in practice; that some old established principles have been treated as obsolete because we have failed to provide adequate means for applying them to new conditions. So far as I can see anything new in the so-called New Nationalism, it is that there shall be a renewed and active sense of loyalty and of duty to the old doctrines and the old ideals of American democracy; that the nation, to the full limit of the power vested in it by the Constitution for the general welfare, and every state, to the full limit of its powers of local self-government under the Constitution, shall wake up to the duties pressing upon them, for intelligent government keeping pace in its effectiveness with the changing conditions and

requirements of our time. That is all that I find new in the so-called New Nationalism, and I am heartily in favor of that and I know that you are heartily in favor of it.

I have said that this idea of voting for or against Mr. Roosevelt, who is not a candidate, tended to make some of my Republican friends abandon the grave and substantial questions with which the people of the state ought to deal at this election. Such questions certainly are before us, and it will not be very creditable to the people of the state if they permit themselves to be diverted from dealing with those questions on their merits.

What gave Mr. Roosevelt his leadership of the Saratoga convention? He had no office; he had no patronage; he had no money; he could neither punish nor reward any one; and the controlling political organization of the Republican party was against him. How did it happen that a majority of the delegates voted with him and against the organization? The answer is, that there was an issue before the convention in which the people of the state were deeply interested. Mr. Roosevelt espoused the right side of that issue against the Republican organization, and naturally enough he furnished the element of leadership to the side he was with. A majority of the delegates voted with him because upon that issue the people who elected them were with him. The issue was a revolt against the tyranny of party machines and party leaders. It was a part of that great rebellion which has been going on all over the Union and in so many states has led to new political methods of varying merit — direct primaries; direct election of senators; the initiative and referendum, and recall — all devices to enable voters to have their way notwithstanding political machines, and to deprive the professional politician of the opportunity to barter and trade for his own purposes, with the power to manipulate and control conventions and dele-

gations and to confer nominations and appointments to office as his stock in trade. The feeling had been emphasized in this state by revelations of corruption in the legislature at Albany, of direct bribery of organization legislators and indirect control of legislation through alleged political contributions. For three years Governor Hughes had waged an incessant warfare by vigorous and outspoken appeals to the people of the state for reform in political methods and emancipation from machine control. The organizations of both political parties had stubbornly resisted the demand. A majority of the Democrats in the legislature, aided by a minority of the Republicans, had defeated not merely the direct primary bill of the governor but the more moderate and tentative measure which the governor approved and which Seth Low and Joseph H. Choate and Henry L. Stimson and President Schurman of Cornell, and President Butler of Columbia, and a dozen other leaders of opinion in the state had petitioned the legislature to pass. It had become apparent to thoughtful Republicans that a majority of the Republican vote of the state was with Governor Hughes and against the organization. President Taft had openly and repeatedly declared as early as April last his opinion that the interests of the party in the state of New York required that the management should be changed. The management declined to yield and it was plain that at the next state convention a struggle was to take place between the unorganized voters of the Republican party who supported the demands of Governor Hughes, and the highly disciplined and skillful organization which opposed his demands. It is a matter of common knowledge that in June, shortly after Mr. Roosevelt returned from Europe, Governor Hughes induced him to come to the aid of the cause the governor represented and to announce his position by a telegram advising the passage of the moderate primary reform bill.

So the lines were drawn for the September convention with Mr. Roosevelt on that side of the controversy. He did his part in the struggle with his customary force, ability, and natural qualities of leadership. It was not his fight; it was Governor Hughes's fight; it was President Taft's fight; it was the fight of the voters against the machine, it was your fight and mine; the fight of every man who loves good government and believes it essential to democratic government that the great body of the people shall have a full, fair, and free opportunity for the expression of their will. With Mr. Roosevelt's aid and with his leadership, the voters of the party controlled the convention against the organization and turned the old organization out. They committed the party in the great deliberative assembly of its lawful representatives to the principles for which Governor Hughes had contended and the policies for which President Taft had declared. We ought to be grateful to Mr. Roosevelt for the service he has rendered, and the voters of the state ought to reap the fruits of the victory he has helped them to win.

Voters of the Republican party, where do you stand on this issue? Do you wish to continue the same old methods of political control which have been characterized by the damning facts disclosed in the Albany investigations? Or do you wish for simpler and purer political methods, and full and unhampered opportunity to control your own political affairs, and party and public officers responsible to you rather than responsible to clever managers who control nominations in the old way? If you are for the Hughes view of this question, then you must show it by your votes for the candidates who represent that view and are the standard-bearers in the fight for your equal and untrammelled opportunity. You will find no place in the Democratic party for the advocacy of such a view; for that party, whatever it may say in its platform, is sending back to the legislature the leaders and

the great body of that band, who, with a minority of the Republicans in the last legislature, defeated the reform legislation of the last session. And it has delivered itself over to the complete control of Tammany Hall, the most flagrant organization of machine political control known to American politics.

There is another subject of great moment that we have to attend to at this election. The state is engaged in engineering works of enormous magnitude. It is spending one hundred million dollars upon the barge canal, fifty million dollars of state money for the construction of good roads, and fifty million dollars more from local municipalities for the same purpose, and an indefinite number of millions for the removal of grade crossings. That work is being done honestly, faithfully, and efficiently. Its conduct is characterized by the qualities of the Hughes administration. The Republican party proposes to continue for the prosecution of this work the state engineer, Mr. Williams, whose uprightness and efficiency have been proved; and for the great financial officer of the state it has nominated Mr. Thompson, of Troy. He has a clean and wholesome record, and is a man of the highest character. The Democratic party allotted these two great offices to Tammany Hall and nominated for them men named by Mr. Murphy. What Tammany Hall does with contracts we may learn from the Skene case. Skene was the state engineer and surveyor elected upon the Democratic ticket four years ago and in charge of the barge canal and road improvement work. He has been indicted and tried for helping contractors to defraud the state. In the particular case tried, it appeared that after the bids for a contract were opened the bid upon which the award was made was raised from \$61,000 to \$70,000, just under the next higher bid, so that the state, which, under the bid, was entitled to have the work done for \$61,000, was made to pay for the work

\$70,000. The difference was divided between the contractor and somebody in the state engineer and surveyor's office. There were, I understand, many other similar cases, and the amount lost to the state by this course of proceeding is variously estimated at from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. Skene was a product of Tammany Hall and his defense was, not that the fraud was not committed, but that the person responsible was an assistant appointed by him from Tammany Hall on the nomination of Murphy. He took refuge personally behind an assertion of his own incompetency, neglect of duty, failure to see the fraud being committed under his very eyes, entire failure to protect the interests of the state. No matter whether his defense was true or not, the incompetency, the neglect of duty, the fraud all belonged to Tammany Hall. They are an illustration of Tammany Hall's dealing with public contracts and they are an illustration of what you have to expect if you put the prosecution of these great undertakings and the expenditure of these enormous sums of money into the hands of Tammany Hall officials for the next two years.

What would you do if the same kind of situation arose in your private business? Would you discharge the superintendent who had been proved to be faithful and efficient, and put the work and the control of the money into the hands of men with such credentials?

This is the private business of each one of us. Whether it be by direct taxation or indirect, whether the payments be from current revenues or the proceeds of bonds, sooner or later, in one way or another, the money honestly spent, the money wasted through incompetency and neglect of duty and the money divided by fraudulent officials with fraudulent contractors comes out of the pockets of the people of the state.

A third subject of primary importance is the continuance of the Republican policy of just and adequate supervision of

transportation corporations expressed in the Public Service Commission laws. Is that policy to be continued? Are the Public Service Commissions to be maintained and strengthened and made still more effective? We know where the Republican party stands upon this, for it passed the laws. We know where Tammany Hall stands by the votes of its representatives. The Republican platform approves the Commission laws. The Democratic platform gives us but the meaningless generality, "We favor reasonable regulation by the state of public service corporations." What they consider reasonable no one knows. But we do know one thing, that they do not include under that head the public service commissioner, for we have the specific utterance of their platform in 1908 denouncing the commissions. The question has been put specifically to Mr. Dix by Mr. Stimson as to where he stands on this question and he has failed to answer. We have fair notice, then, that we may look for a reversal of this Republican policy of supervision by public service commissions, in case the Democratic party comes into power. Are the people of the state ready to reverse that policy? Are they ready to go back to the time when there was nowhere for a shipper to go if he was unjustly treated except to the legislature or to a law-suit? To the time when strike bills in the legislature furnished a profitable occupation, and transportation corporations went into politics in self-defense? If not, if the voters of the state are in favor of this policy, which surely has been most beneficent in its effects both to the people of the state and to the corporations themselves, the time to show it is by their votes in November.

Upon these and a dozen other questions of importance, the action of the voters at the next election is of vital interest to the people of the state. It is important to choose intelligently and considerately between the two candidates for

governor with regard to their personal merits as we know them. Mere respectability is not enough to protect the interests of the state in the governor's chair. High ability and force and character are needed there, and it is important for every one of us to have them there. What do we know of these two candidates?

We know of Mr. Stimson, the Republican candidate, that under President Roosevelt's administration he was United States attorney in New York for several years, receiving a salary much less than he was making from private practice, and that at the close of that administration he retired from office to return to his private law practice; that he was then retained under President Taft's administration as special counsel to conduct prosecutions for certain frauds upon the customs revenue at the port of New York, again receiving for his work as counsel less compensation than he could have made in private practice or than he had been making before he went into the district attorney's office. We know that he administered the office of the district attorney in all its vast and varied affairs with conspicuous fidelity and success.

We know that partly under one administration and partly under the other he did these specific things: he prosecuted the American Sugar Refining Company for receiving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$18,000. He prosecuted it a second time for receiving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$10,000, and two of its officers fined \$1,000 each. He prosecuted it a third time for receiving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$10,000. He prosecuted it a fourth time for receiving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$10,000. He prosecuted it a fifth time for receiving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$50,000, and two of its officers fined \$5,000 each. He prosecuted the Brooklyn Cooperage Company, a subsidiary of the Sugar Company, for receiving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$70,000. He prosecuted the West-

ern Transit Company for giving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$10,000. He prosecuted the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company for giving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$20,000. He prosecuted the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company for giving rebates, convicted it, and had it fined \$20,000. He prosecuted the New York Central Railway Company for giving rebates, convicted it and had it fined \$108,000. By the time the \$338,000 of fines had been imposed, traffic managers and big shippers began to realize that the law against rebates meant something, and we are told that the practice of rebates has come to an end. Show me another man anywhere who has done so much to give living force and effectiveness to that salutary law, or who is more entitled to the respect and gratitude of the small dealers who were being crowded out of business by the advantages their big competitors were gaining over them through discriminatory rates.

We know that he prosecuted the National Sugar Refining Company for frauds against the customs and recovered from it \$604,304.37; and that he prosecuted the great sugar concern of Arbuckle Brothers for similar frauds and recovered from it \$695,753.19; and that he prosecuted the American Sugar Refining Company for similar frauds and recovered from it \$2,135,486.32, making a total of \$3,435,363.88. We know that he prosecuted criminally and convicted and had sentenced to the penitentiary the secretary of the American Sugar Refining Company, and the superintendent of the refinery of that company, and the superintendent of docks of that company and five other of the leading employees of the company, and that the president of the company was dead; and that he prosecuted and convicted the two United States weighers who were found to have been in complicity with the frauds. Show me another case of fraud upon a government where against great wealth and influence and power the hand

of justice has been held so firm and the sword of justice has cut so deep.

We know that it was upon his prosecution that Charles W. Morse, the rich and powerful New York banker, is expiating his sins of high finance in the Atlanta penitentiary. We know that it was he who compelled Edward H. Harriman to answer when he stood upon his alleged constitutional right to refuse information to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Do not suppose that all this was done without brains and skill and tireless energy and force of character in a man able to maintain himself against the greatest lawyers, even including my friend Judge Parker, as counsel for the Sugar Company, and against all the multitude of influences, personal and professional, that these great and powerful defendants, their officers and directors could bring to bear for their protection. It seems to me that this is the kind of a man you need for governor of the state. Do you not think this man would make a good governor? Would he not see that the law was enforced? Would he not see that honesty ruled? Would he not see that crime was punished? Would he not see that every man had his rights and that no man had any privilege to diminish the rights of others?

What do we know about Mr. Dix, the Democratic candidate? He is a reputable gentleman, a director in a number of successful money-making corporations, well considered by his friends and neighbors in the city of Albany, very cautious in his statements about himself and a little loose in his statements about others. He has no public record and he appears to have come in contact with public matters of present interest only once.

The point of contact was the tariff. The great difficulty in making an American tariff law always has been that all the manufacturers of the country flock to Washington with

statements and affidavits and protestations, each one showing that his industry will be ruined by a reduction. Congress has before it nothing to oppose these statements except the arguments of people who have little personal knowledge of any particular business. There are no adequate means of testing the evidence of the manufacturers and reaching the true facts. With the vast growth and complication of our business we have outgrown our method of making tariffs.

Nevertheless this Congress did make a pretty good tariff. There were things in it that I did not like and there were failures in it to do things which I thought ought to be done; but considering all the difficulties under which it was made it was a surprisingly good law and a great improvement on the law it superseded. Under it the average rate of duty has been about eleven per cent less than under the preceding tariff and less than under the Democratic Wilson law. Under it more goods have been admitted free of all duty than ever before in the history of our government — more free goods than ever before to an annual value of over a hundred million dollars; and under it the government revenues have been made adequate and a deficit has been turned into a surplus.

Then, the Republican Congress inaugurated a great practical reform by providing for a permanent board of tariff experts to get at the true facts to which the principle of protection is to be applied and to prevent Congress from ever again having to make a tariff upon the *ex parte* statements of interested persons.

Now the Democratic platform condemns that law and Mr. Dix personally denounces it and charges the Republican party with bad faith in not revising the tariff downward.

Yet among the people who crowded the halls of the National Capital, making the lives of members of Congress a burden by their clamor against downward revision of the tariff, were the representatives of Mr. Dix's Standard Wall

Paper Company. What they urged appears in this paper which I read from the Tariff Hearings for the Committee on Ways and Means, Volume 6, Page 6252:

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WALL PAPER MANUFACTURERS ASKING FOR INCREASE OF DUTY

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 21, 1910.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: --

The wall-paper manufacturers whose signatures are hereto affixed respectfully ask your consideration of the effect produced upon the wall-paper industry by the rapidly increasing importation of wall papers, due to the low rate of duty applying to same under the present tariff, according to Schedule M, paragraph 402, law of 1897, wherein the duty is placed at twenty-five per cent *ad valorem*, and hope that our arguments will justify you in recommending a material increase in the rate of duty in order that the manufacturer may be afforded at least some relief from the present discouraging conditions, etc., etc.

Then, after referring to the materials of which wall paper is made, the paper proceeds:

We appreciate the fact that these so-called raw materials, as far as wall paper is concerned, are finished productions in themselves, and that it might work an injustice to other industries in this country to have the duty on such materials reduced, and, because of these facts, we ask for an increased duty on foreign wall papers.

Among the signatures to this paper is "Standard Wall Paper Company, W. A. Huppuch, First Vice-President." This is the same Huppuch whom Mr. Dix and Mr. Murphy have made chairman of the Democratic State Committee to aid Mr. Dix in denouncing the Republican party for not revising the tariff downward.

What inferences are we to draw as to the sincerity of the man who can take these two positions, one for his private interests and the other as a candidate for effect upon the public? Is this gentleman not rather too — I will say — "adaptable" to be an ideal governor of the state?

Can any one doubt on what we know of these candidates which one of the two is the better fitted to protect the great interests of the state in the governor's chair at Albany?

My Republican friends, no individual and no people ever got and held good, faithful, and effective service without recognizing and approving such service. If you would have your servants loyal and true you must be loyal and true to them in accordance with their deserts. Nor does any people succeed in any cause, whether it be to conserve what is good or to win forward in progress toward better things, unless it be by resolute adherence to purpose through long years of effort unswerved by temporary gusts of passion or prejudice. Our party is sound and wholesome. Since the last election, when it received general public approval it has given, both in Congress and in our state legislature, a great array of wise and useful legislation. It has uncloaked and punished its own wrongdoers. The administrations of President Taft in Washington and of Governor Hughes in Albany have been models of uprightness and efficiency. The party still represents, and faithfully represents, better than any other political organization does or ever has, the great fundamental principles upon which our country must stand if it shall continue prosperous and deserving of prosperity. If you believe in Taft and Hughes and the men who with them and with you have been rendering loyal service to the country and to the state, then stand by them with your votes. Some of you are thinking, because of a temporary side wind of personal feeling and prejudice, of deserting the cause for which we have been fighting together for many years, and giving aid and comfort to all that you most abhor in politics. I beg of you not to do so. You would gratify a momentary feeling, but you would do a harm to your country and to your state, and you would regret it hereafter.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS

ADDRESS AS CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
CONVENTION, CHICAGO, JUNE 18, 1912

BELOWE that I appreciate this expression of confidence. I wish I were more competent for the service you require of me.

The struggle for leadership in the Republican party which has so long engrossed the attention and excited the feelings of its members is about to be determined by the selection of a candidate. The varying claims of opinion for recognition in the political creed of the party are about to be settled by the adoption of a platform.

The supreme council of the party in this great national convention, representing every state and territory in due proportion, according to rules long since established, is about to appeal to the American people for a continuance of the power of government which the party has exercised with but brief interruptions for more than half a century, and that appeal is to be based upon the soundness of the principles approved, and the qualities of the candidates selected by the convention.

In the performance of this duty by the convention, and in the acceptance of its conclusions by Republicans, is to be applied the ever-recurring test of a party's fitness to govern, its coherence and its formative and controlling power of organization. And these depend upon the willingness of the members of the party to subordinate their varying individual opinions and postpone the matters of difference between

them in order that they may act in unison upon the great questions wherein they agree; upon their willingness and capacity to thrust aside the disappointment which some of them must always feel in failing to secure success for the candidates of their preference; upon the loyalty of party members to the party itself, to the great organization whose agency in government they believe to be for the best interests of the nation, and for whose continuance in power their love of country constrains them to labor.

Without these things there can be no party worthy of the name. Without them party association is a rope of sand, party organization is an ineffective form, party responsibility disappears, and with it disappears the right to public confidence.

Without organized parties, having these qualities of coherence and loyalty, free popular government becomes a confused and continual conflict between a vast multitude of individual opinions, individual interests, individual attractions and repulsions, from which effective government can emerge only by answering to the universal law of necessary organization and again forming parties.

Throughout our party's history in each presidential election we have gone to the American people with the confident and just assertion that the Republican party is not a mere fortuitous collection of individuals, but is a coherent and living force as an organization. It is effective, responsible, worthy of confidence, competent to govern. The traditions of its great struggles for liberty, for the supremacy of law, for the preservation of constitutional government, for national honor, exercise a controlling influence upon its conduct. The lofty purpose of its great originators has been transmitted by spiritual succession from generation to generation of party leaders, and it is no idle rhetoric when we say, as we have so often said and are about to say again to the American people:

“ We are entitled to your belief in the sincerity of the principles we profess and the loyalty of our candidates to those principles, because we are the party of Lincoln, and Sumner, and Seward, and Andrew, and Morton, and Grant, and Hayes, and Garfield, and Arthur, and Harrison, and Blaine, and Hoar, and McKinley.”

We claim that we are entitled to a popular vote of confidence at the coming election because we have demonstrated that we are the party of affirmative, constructive policies for the betterment and progress of our country in all the fields upon which the activity and influence of government can rightly enter. We claim it because we have shown ourselves a party of honest, efficient, and economical administration in which public moneys are faithfully applied, appointments are made on grounds of merit, efficient service is rigorously exacted, graft is reduced to a minimum, derelictions from official duty are sternly punished, and a high standard of official morality is maintained. We claim it because we have maintained and promoted peace with the world, and the dignity, honor, and just interests of the United States among the nations. We claim it because our party stands now, as it has ever stood, for order and liberty and for the maintenance of the constitutional system of government through which a self-controlled democracy for more than a century has established against all detractors the competency of the American people to govern themselves in law-abiding prosperity. We challenge the judgment of the American people on the policies of McKinley and Roosevelt and Taft.

President Taft, in his speech of acceptance on July 28, 1908, paid a just tribute to the great service rendered by his predecessor in awakening the public conscience, inaugurating reforms, and saving the country from the dangers of a plutocratic government. He instanced the Railroad Rate Law, the prevention of railroad rebates and discriminations, the

enforcement of the Anti-trust Law, the Pure Food Law, the Meat Inspection Law, the general supervision and control of transportation companies, the conservation of natural resources, and he proceeded to say:

The chief function of the next Administration, in my judgment, is distinct from and a progressive development of that which has been performed by President Roosevelt. The chief function of the next Administration is to complete and perfect the machinery by which these standards may be maintained, by which the law-breakers may be promptly restrained and punished, but which shall operate with sufficient accuracy and dispatch to interfere with legitimate business as little as possible.

There spoke the voice of two Republican administrations, and the promise of that declaration has been faithfully observed with painstaking and assiduous care. The Republican administration which is now drawing to a close has engaged in completing and perfecting the machinery, in applying the standards and working out the practical results of established Republican policies, including also the McKinley policies of a protective tariff and sound finance. Service of this kind is not spectacular. It receives little public attention and little credit until the public mind is turned to a careful study of the subject, but it is of the highest importance. Great constructive national policies are not established by simple declaration or mere legislation or in a single day or in a single year. They always change conditions in order to better them. They encounter inveterate abuses. They are opposed and evaded in practice. They require to be applied and enforced by a strong hand and a firm will. They require to be perfected by administration and supplemental legislation. Under Republican administrations there has been one unbroken, continuous course of consistent policy and effective performance in dealing with the evils which have been naturally incident to the amazing industrial changes of our generation, the vast creation of new wealth,

the increase of our population and the expansion of our commerce. It rests with the American electorate to say whether they will permit those minor dissatisfactions which are inseparable from all human performance and the desire for change by which all men are sometimes affected, to obscure in their judgments the wisdom of continuing the execution of these policies and the evil of chartering another and untried party for a new departure in governmental experiment.

The Republican party stands now, as McKinley stood, for a protective tariff, while the Democratic party stands against the principle of protection and for a tariff for revenue only. We stand not for the abuses of the tariff but for the beneficent uses. No tariff can be devised so moderate, so reasonable, that it will not be rejected by the Democratic party, provided its duties be adjusted with reference to labor cost so as to protect American products against being driven out of the market by foreign under-selling made possible through the lower rate of wages in other countries. The American foreign merchant service has been driven off the face of the waters because with American sailors' wages and the American standard of living it could not compete with foreign shipping. The Democratic party proposes to put American mills and factories and mines in the same position, and the American people have now to say whether they wish that to be done.

I have said that we do not stand for the abuses of the tariff. The chief cause of abuse has been that we have outgrown our old method of tariff-making. Our productive industries have become too vast and complicated, our commercial relations too extensive, for any committee of Congress of itself to get at the facts to which the principle of protection may be properly applied. The Republican party proposes to remedy this defective method through having the facts ascertained by an impartial commission through

thorough, scientific investigation, so that the President and Congress shall have the basis for the just application of the principle of protection. The Republican Congress included in the Payne-Aldrich bill a clause under which the President had authority to appoint such a board to make such investigations and report the results to him. The President appointed the board. Its members are drawn from both political parties. Their competency, integrity, and fairness are unquestioned. They have reported upon the woolen schedule; they have reported upon the cotton schedule. The President has transmitted their findings to Congress. The Democratic House of Representatives ignores and repudiates them. In January, 1911, the last Republican House of Representatives passed a bill to create a tariff commission with much broader and more effective powers for compelling the attendance of witnesses and securing information, charged to report its findings to the Congress. The bill passed the Senate with some amendment but it was delayed there by an avowed Democratic filibuster until it reached the House so late in the session that a vote upon it was prevented by another Democratic filibuster in the House. Now the House is Democratic and the Tariff Commission bill is dead. The Democratic party does not want the facts upon which a just protective measure can be framed, because it means that there shall be no protection for American industries. In the last session and in the present session of Congress the Democratic House has framed and passed a series of tariff bills for revenue only, with complete indifference to the absolute destruction that their enactment would bring upon great American industries. Some of them have fallen by the wayside in the Senate and some of them have gone to the President to meet his wise and courageous veto. The American people have now to pass, not upon the abuses of

the tariff, but upon the fundamental question between the two systems of tariff-making.

The national currency, which the election of McKinley rescued from disaster at the hands of a Free Silver Democracy, still rests upon the Civil War basis of government bonds, and is no longer adapted to our changed conditions. It is inelastic; its volume does not expand and contract according to legitimate demands of business. It subjects us to constant danger of panics which begin in speculation and end in paralyzing business. It facilitates and promotes the arbitrary control by a small group of banks and bankers with enormous capital, and tends to an undue concentration of the money of the country in a few great money centers. Any possible remedy involves the study of world-wide finance, because we are no longer isolated and money flows from city to city and country to country in accordance with the laws of demand and supply and the attraction of interest rates. No Congress could by its ordinary methods get beyond the surface of the vast and complicated problem, yet the working out of a new system adapted to American conditions is of vital importance to the prosperity of the country and the security of every business and of every man whose support is directly or indirectly dependent upon American business. For the solution of this question the policy of the Republican party established a Monetary Commission, which has made a most thorough and exhaustive study of the financial systems of all civilized nations, of their relations to our own system, and the needs of American business. The Commission has reported a bill for the establishment of a new system of reserve associations under which the currency will be elastic, the business of the country will find ready sale for its commercial paper, the people of the country at large will exercise control instead of a little group of large bankers, and

the danger of panics will disappear. The President has recommended the conclusions of the Commission to the Congress, where the proposed bill is under consideration. It is for the interest of every business man in the United States that the party controlling the government shall not be changed until this policy has been carried into execution.

In order that the burdens of government support may in time of need be more justly proportioned to the means of our citizens, the last Republican Congress submitted to the legislatures of the states an income tax amendment of the Constitution, and at the same time, upon the recommendation of the President, enacted a law — which has been sustained by the Supreme Court — imposing a tax upon corporations, measured by their income, so that this vast fund of invested capital may bear its fair share of the public burdens. At the rate of only one per cent upon corporate income, the receipts from this source during the past year amounted to over thirty million dollars.

Upon the recommendation of the President the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission have been greatly enlarged and their control over railroad rates and railroad service made more effective. Railroad rebates have been vigorously prosecuted and the imposition of large fines has substantially ended the practice. Upon prosecutions of railroad discriminations and fraudulent importations at the custom house, under the vigorous treatment of the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice, the fines and recoveries of the past three years have amounted to over nine million dollars.

The prosecution of trusts and combinations in violation of the Sherman Act has proceeded with extraordinary vigor and success. The Standard Oil Company has been dissolved by a suit begun under Roosevelt and brought to a successful conclusion under Taft, through a judgment in exact accord-

ance with the prayer of the complainant. The Tobacco Company has been dissolved and its property scattered among fourteen different companies, with stringent injunctions against common control, which, in the unanimous opinion of the four judges of the Circuit Court of Appeals, were fully adequate to accomplish the relief demanded. The beef packers, the wholesale grocers, the lumber dealers, the wire makers, the window-glass pool, the electric lamp combination, the bath tub trust, the shoe machinery trust, the foreign steamship pool, the Sugar Company, the Steel Corporation, the Harvester Company — all have been made to feel the heavy hand of the law through suits or indictments against restraints and monopolies.

Throughout that wide field in which the conditions of modern industrial life require that government shall intervene in the name of social justice for the protection of the wage-earner, the Republican national administrations in succession have done their full, enlightened, and progressive duty to the limit of the national power under the Constitution. The Act of March 4, 1907, to regulate the hours of service of railroad employees, passed under the Roosevelt administration, has been sustained in the Supreme Court under the Taft administration and has been enforced by more than fifteen hundred prosecutions during the past three years. A valid and effective Employers Liability Act applying to all interstate commerce was passed by a Republican Congress on April 5, 1910, and under the Republican administration its constitutionality has been sustained in the Supreme Court. Upon the President's recommendation a joint commission was created by Congress to study the subject of workmen's compensation for injuries. It was composed of members of both Houses, with a representative of the railroads and a representative of labor, and after exhaustive examination and hearings the commission framed a bill

which was approved by all the great railroad labor organizations and which was passed by a Republican Senate at the present session against the opposition of a majority of the Democratic Senators. That bill still slumbers in the Democratic Judiciary Committee of the House. The Safety Appliance Act has been strengthened by increased powers in the Interstate Commerce Commission and has been enforced by nearly a thousand prosecutions during the past three years. The joint representative of the great orders of Railway Conductors, Railway Trainmen, Locomotive Engineers, and Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, says in his report on national legislation for 1911 regarding that department of the present national administration especially concerned in the enforcement of these laws:

Justice to one who has been faithful to his trust demands from every representative of the railroad men of the United States some recognition of the splendid work of the Attorney-General in the enforcement of all the acts of Congress relating to the safety of railroad employees, and limiting their hours of service. It has been work faithfully and successfully performed. Both in the defense of our rights in the courts and in assistance rendered us in the preparation of proposed legislation, his work has been of a high order of ability and has been tendered in a spirit of fidelity to the basic principles of fair play to all men.

The newly created Bureau of Mines and the newly authorized Children's Bureau mark the limit to which the National Government can go towards improving the conditions of intrastate labor without usurping the powers of the states. The Pure Food Law has been enforced with vigor and effectiveness. There have been over five hundred prosecutions for violations of that law within the past year and more than a thousand cases within the past three years. More than five hundred shipments of adulterated and misbranded foods and drugs have been condemned and forfeited, and enormous quantities of injurious food material have been destroyed.

The conservation of natural resources has been in the hands of its friends. The process of examining and separating the timber and the agricultural land in the great forest reserves, established at the close of the last Administration, has proceeded under the present Administration in accordance with the original plan. The study of the water resources of the country and the recording of the flow of streams have gone on under the Geological Survey. Classification and appraisal of coal lands and their restoration to entry at discriminating prices based upon the classification has been extended to over sixteen million acres of a total valuation of over seven hundred and twelve million dollars. The enormous petroleum deposits and phosphate deposits and water power sites belonging to the Government have been examined and classified and the data prepared for the needed legislation to regulate their disposition. Construction under the arid land reclamation projects has been pressed forward, and over fifty thousand people are now living upon the reclaimed land.

Great reforms have been made in the economy of the public service. A commission appointed by the President has been examining all the departments of government operating under the antiquated statutes passed generations ago with a view to applying in them the labor-saving and money-saving methods which have made the success of the great business establishments of our country. In the Treasury Department alone, where the reforms first received their effect and can best be measured, over eighteen hundred places have been abolished, and this with increased efficiency of service, and without discharging any one but simply by not filling vacancies as they occurred. The savings effected in the administration of this one department amount approximately to \$2,631,000 per annum. The same policy in the Post Office Department has made that department self-

supporting for the first time in thirty years, and has changed a deficit of \$17,479,770.47 in 1909, caused especially by the increased cost of rural free delivery, to a surplus of \$219,118.12 in 1911. In the meantime the great Republican policy of rural free delivery has been advanced so that the rural free delivery routes now number 42,199, covering a mileage of 1,210,447 miles. In the meantime also the new Republican policy of the postal savings system has been successfully inaugurated under the Act of June 25, 1910, beginning experimentally with a few offices, and now, after eleven months of operation, extending to seventy-five hundred presidential post offices and \$11,000,000 of deposits.

The army has been made more efficient. The great process of training not only the regular army but the militia by means of officers of instruction and joint operations has been pressed forward to the end that if war unfortunately comes upon us we shall have, for the first time in our history, a great body of trained American citizens competent to act as officers of the volunteer force upon which we must so largely depend for our military defense. The test of mobilization of the regular army in Texas during the summer of 1911, with its rapidity of movement and freedom from disease, has exhibited a record of competency and ability most reassuring and satisfactory.

The navy has improved its organization and decreased its expenses, has increased its preparedness and military efficiency, has improved its marksmanship and skill in seamanship and evolution, and has reorganized and reduced the cost of the system of construction, repair, and supply.

The execution of the regular and established program of adding two battleships to the fleet annually to take the place of the old ships which from year to year grow obsolete, and to maintain the position of our navy among those of the great powers, has met with a reverse in the refusal of the Demo-

eratic House of Representatives to appropriate any money for the construction of battleships, and the question now stands between the Republican Senate and the Democratic House as to whether our navy shall be maintained or shall be permitted to fall back to a level with the weaker and unconsidered countries of the world. What is the will of the American people on that question?

The construction of the Panama Canal has been pressed forward with renewed evidences under the concentrated observation of all the civilized world, that America possesses constructive genius, organizing power, and habits of honest administration, equal to the greatest undertakings. It is manifest now that the work will be done in advance of the time fixed and within the cost estimated, and that during the coming year it will be substantially completed. Will not the American people consider whether they have no grateful appreciation of the honor brought to us all by the great thing that has been done on the Isthmus? When the wonderful procession of ships takes its way for the first time through the canal between the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific, will the people of America wish that the honors of that greater than a Roman triumph be given, not to the men who executed the great design, but to the men who opposed and scoffed and hindered and sought to frustrate the enterprise, until in spite of them its success was assured?

In our foreign relations, controversies of almost a hundred years over the Northeastern fisheries have been settled by arbitration at The Hague. The attempt to preserve the fur seal life of the Alaskan islands, in which we were defeated twenty years ago in the Behring Sea arbitration, has been brought to success by diplomacy in the Fur Seal Treaty with Great Britain, Japan, and Russia. The delicate questions arising from the termination of our treaty regulating trade and travel with Japan have been disposed of by a new treaty

satisfactory to both nations and to the people of both coasts of our own nation. Our tariff relations with all the world under the maximum and minimum clause of the Payne-Aldrich bill have been readjusted. The Departments of State and Commerce and Labor have promoted the extension of American commerce so that our foreign exports have grown from \$1,491,744,641, in 1905, to \$2,013,549,025, in 1911, and the balance of trade in our favor for 1911 was \$522,094,094. American rights have been asserted and maintained and peace with all the world has been preserved and strengthened.

With this record of consistent policy and faithful service the Republican party can rest with confidence on its title to command the approval of the American people. We have a right to say that we can be trusted to preserve and maintain the American system of free representative government handed down to us by our fathers. At our hands it will be no empty form when the officers of the National Government subscribe the solemn oath required of them by law, "That I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

We shall not apologize for American institutions. We cherish with gratitude and reverence the memory of the great men who devised the American constitutional system — their unselfish patriotism, their love of liberty and justice, their lofty conception of human rights, their deep insight into the strength and the weakness of human nature, their wise avoidance of the dangers which had wrecked all preceding attempts at popular government, their breadth of view which adapted the system they devised to the progress and development of a great people. We will be loyal to the principles they declared and to the spirit of liberty and progress, of

justice and security, which they breathed into that immortal instrument.

No government which must be administered by weak and fallible men can be perfect, but we may justly claim for our government under the Constitution that for a century and a quarter it has worked out the best results for individual liberty and progress in civilization yet achieved by governmental institutions. Under the peace and security which it has afforded, not only has our country become vastly rich but there has been a diffusion of wealth which should inspire cheerful confidence in the future. Witness the 9,597,185 separate savings bank accounts, with \$4,212,583,598 deposits in the year 1911. Witness the 6,361,502 farms, and the value of farms and farm property of \$40,991,449,090 in the year 1910, a value more than doubled between 1900 and 1910. Witness the stream of immigrants pouring in from all countries of the earth to share the happier lot of labor in our fortunate land — 9,673,973 of them since 1901. Nowhere on earth is there such unfettered scope for the independence of individual manhood; nowhere greater security and competency for the family home; nowhere more universal advantages of education for rich and poor alike; nowhere such universal response to all demands of charity and noble plans for relieving the distress and improving the condition of mankind; nowhere a more ready quickening of public spirit under the influence of high ideals; nowhere the true ends of government more fully secured, than in the life of America today under the government of the Constitution.

We will maintain the power and honor of the nation, but we will observe those limitations which the Constitution sets up for the preservation of local self-government. This country is so large and the conditions of life are so varied that it would be intolerable to have the local and domestic affairs

of our home communities, which involve no national rights, controlled by majorities made up in other states thousands of miles away, or by the officials of a central government.

We will perform the duties and exercise the authority of the offices with which we may be invested, but we will observe and require all officials to observe those constitutional limitations which prescribe the boundaries of official power. However wise, however able, however patriotic, a congress or an executive may be, however convinced they may be that the doing of a particular thing would be beneficial to the public — if that thing be done by usurping the powers confided to another department or another officer it but opens the door for the destruction of liberty. The door opened for the patriotic and well-meaning to exercise power not conferred upon them by law is the door opened also to the self-seeking and ambitious. There can be no free government in which official power is not limited, and the limitations upon official power can be preserved only by rigorously insisting upon their observance.

We will make and vigorously enforce laws for the promotion of public interests and the attainment of public ends, but we will observe those great rules of right conduct which our fathers embodied in the limitations of the Constitution. We will hold sacred the declarations and prohibitions of the Bill of Rights, which protect the life and liberty and property of the citizen against the power of government. We will keep the covenant that our fathers made, and that we have reaffirmed from generation to generation, between the whole body of the people, and every individual under national jurisdiction. It is a covenant between overwhelming power and every weak and defenseless one, every one who relies upon the protection of his country's laws for security to enjoy the fruits of industry and thrift, every one who would worship God according to his conscience, however his faith

may differ from that of his fellows, every one who asserts his manhood's right of freedom in speech and action — a solemn covenant that between the weak individual and all the power of the people and the people's officers shall forever stand the eternal principles of justice declared, defined, and made practically effective by specific rules in those provisions which we call the limitations of the Constitution. That covenant between power and weakness is the chief basis of American prosperity, American progress, and American liberty. It is because we have always observed it that we are not torn by dissension and revolution and civil war and alternating anarchy and despotism like so many of our sister republics whose unhappy fortune we deplore. With all our pride in our vast material prosperity, in our successful institutions and our advance in civilization, we would not be boastful and vainglorious, for we come of God-fearing people, and we have learned the truth taught by religion that all men are prone to error, are subject to temptation, are led astray by impulse. We know that this is as true in government as it is in private life, for the freedom that some of our fathers sought was freedom of conscience from the control of majorities; and our party was born in protest against the extension of a system of human slavery approved and maintained by majorities. We know that there is no safe course in the life of men or of nations except to establish and to follow declared principles of conduct. There is a divine principle of justice which men cannot make or unmake, which is above all governments, above all legislatures, above all majorities. Conformity to it is a condition of national life. The American people have set up this eternal law of justice as the guide for their national action. They have formulated and expressed it in practical rules of conduct established by them impersonally, abstractly, when no interest or impulse or specific desire was present to sway their judgment. Upon

submission and conformity to these rules of justice depends our existence as a nation; and as we love our country and hope for the continuance of its peace and liberty to our children's children, we should humbly and reverently seek for strength and wisdom to abide by the principles of the Constitution against the days of our temptation and weakness.

With a deep sense of duty so to order our country's government that the blessings which God has vouchsafed to us may be continued, we can be trusted to keep the pledge given to the American people by the last Republican national convention:

The Republican Party will uphold at all times the authority and integrity of the courts, state and federal, and will ever insist that their powers to enforce their process and to protect life, liberty, and property shall be preserved inviolate.

We must be true to that pledge, for in no other way can our country keep itself within the strait and narrow path prescribed by the principles of right conduct embodied in our Constitution.

The limitations upon arbitrary power, and the prohibitions of the Bill of Rights which protect liberty and insure justice cannot be enforced except through the determinations of an independent and courageous judiciary.

We shall be true to that Republican pledge. The great courts in which Marshall, and Story, and Harlan sat will not be degraded from their high office. Their judges will not be punished for honest decisions; their judgments will be respected and obeyed. The keystone of this balanced and stable structure of government, established by our fathers, will not be shattered by Republican hands; for we stand with Alexander Hamilton, who said, in *The Federalist*:

For I agree that there is no liberty where the power of judging be not separate from the legislative and executive powers:

we stand with John Marshall, who said, in *Marbury vs. Madison*:

To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limitations may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained?

and we stand with Abraham Lincoln, who said, in his First Inaugural:

A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinion and sentiment, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or despotism.

THE RENOMINATION OF PRESIDENT TAFT

SPEECH AS CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1912, NOTIFYING MR. TAFT OF HIS NOMINATION, WASHINGTON, AUGUST 1, 1912

As chairman of the Republican National Convention of 1912, Mr. Root was charged by the convention to convey formal notification of his renomination as the Republican candidate for President of the United States to William H. Taft. This official notification was conveyed to the President at the White House on August 1, 1912, in the following address:

MR. PRESIDENT, the committee of notification here present has the honor to advise you formally that on the twenty-second day of June last you were regularly and duly nominated by the national convention of the Republican party to be the Republican candidate for President for the term beginning March 4, 1913.

For the second time in the history of the Republican party a part of the delegates have refused to be bound by the action of the convention. Now, as on the former occasion, the irreconcilable minority declares its intention to support either your Democratic opponent or a third candidate. The reason assigned for this course is dissatisfaction with the decision of certain contests in the making up of the temporary roll of the convention. Those contests were decided by the tribunal upon which the law that has governed the Republican party for more than forty years imposed the duty of deciding such contests. So long as those decisions were made honestly and in good faith, all persons were bound to accept them as conclusive in the making up of the temporary roll of the convention, and neither in the facts and arguments produced before the national committee, the committee on credentials and the convention itself, nor otherwise, does

there appear just ground for impeaching the honesty and good faith of the committee's decisions. Both the making up of the temporary roll and the rights accorded to the persons upon that roll, whose seats were contested, were in accordance with the long-established and unquestioned rules of law governing the party, and founded upon justice and common sense. Your title to the nomination is as clear and unimpeachable as the title of any candidate of any party since political conventions began.

Your selection has a broader basis than a mere expression of choice between different party leaders representing the same ideas. You have been nominated because you stand preëminently for certain fixed and essential principles which the Republican party maintains. You believe in preserving the constitutional government of the United States. You believe in the rule of law rather than the rule of men. You realize that the only safety for nations, as for individuals, is to establish and abide by declared principles of action. You are in sympathy with the great practical rules of right conduct that the American people have set up for their own guidance and self-restraint in the limitations of the Constitution — the limitations upon governmental and official power essential to the preservation of liberty and justice. You know that to sweep away these wise rules of self-restraint would be not progress, but decadence. You know that the great declarations of principle in our Constitution cannot be made an effectual guide to conduct in any other way than by judicial judgment upon attempts to violate them; and you maintain the independence, dignity, and authority of the courts of the United States. You are for progress along all the lines of national development, but for progress which still preserves the good we already have and holds fast to those essential elements of American institutions which have made our country prosperous and great and free. You rep-

resent the spirit of kindly consideration by every American citizen toward all his fellows, respect for the right of adverse opinion, peaceable methods of settling differences — the spirit and the method which make ordered and peaceful self-government possible, as distinguished from intolerance and hatred and violence.

In respect to all these things our country is threatened from many sides. It is your high privilege to be the standard-bearer for the cause in which you believe; and in that cause of peace and justice and liberty, the millions of your countrymen who believe as you do will stand with you, and the great party which was born in the struggle for constitutional freedom will support you.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN OPPOSITION

ADDRESS AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN
STATE CONVENTION AT SARATOGA SPRINGS
NEW YORK, AUGUST 18, 1914

THIS New York Republican State Convention meets under novel conditions. For the first time, the state convention has no power to nominate candidates for office. Under the new primary law the candidates will be selected by the voters of the party at the primary election on the twenty-eighth of September. The first and most obvious duty of the Republicans of the state and of the members of this convention representing them, is loyal and effective acceptance of the primary election law. It is true that the law is defective. In some respects it reads as if it had been framed with a view to get credit for a popular act rather than with a view to make a practical working statute. In some respects the act seems as if it were designed to perpetuate and strengthen the control of political managers rather than to give the voters real and effective freedom of choice. Probably the law can be much improved; but the only way to bring about the improvement is to submit the law to the test of practical application, to put it in operation in good faith, and then whatever defects there are, will become manifest in such a way that it will be easy to cure them.

Nevertheless this convention was necessary. The primary law provides that any party may hold "party conventions to be constituted in such manner and to have such powers in relation to formulating party platforms and policies and the transaction of business relating to party affairs as the rules

and regulations of the party may provide not inconsistent with the provisions " of the law. Such a convention as this statute contemplates was necessary, first, to consider and agree upon a platform upon which the candidates of the party, when chosen, are to stand and by which the people of the state may be informed of the principles to be applied in government if the Republican candidates are elected. This is something which cannot be done by the voters at the primary. Their action is limited by the law to the selection of candidates. It is something which ought not to be done by any self-constituted and irresponsible person or group assuming to act for the party, but it should be done in the open, by accredited representatives of all parts of the state. It cannot be done by the candidates when selected because that would be a reversal of the fundamental idea of political parties, which is that the people of a country divide according to the differences of their political views upon matters of greatest importance, and, upon one side and another, the voters who agree among themselves upon these fundamental questions subordinate all minor differences of feeling and opinion and unite to select candidates who will give effect to their common judgment. To hand the party declaration of principles over to the candidate after his selection would be to deny the whole rational basis of American party government, upon which this new primary election law depends. It would be to make the principles of the party depend upon the opinions of the candidate instead of having the candidate stand upon the principles of the party. And it would transform our system of parties into purely personal followings of popular leaders, — which Heaven forbid, because that basis of political action always has been and must be inconsistent with orderly and effective popular self-government.

The second duty which the convention has to perform is to consider, and I assume to approve, the proposal of the

National Committee of the party to make representation in national conventions conform more closely to the Republican vote in the several states and to leave the method of selecting the delegates to the regulation of the Republicans in each state. The most salient effect of this change will be a considerable reduction of representation from the Southern States, where a very small Republican vote is cast. I assume the proposed change will be approved because the representatives of the state of New York have steadfastly voted for such a change in successive national conventions, and the Saratoga convention of 1913 expressly declared in favor of it. The reason for acting now is that if the rules are to be changed for the next national convention, it must be done before the delegates to that convention are elected. The present rules of the party regulating representation in national conventions were adopted in 1880, after much discussion by the national convention, at which the late Senator George F. Hoar presided, and James A. Garfield was nominated for President. Those rules are binding upon the National Committee. If they remain unchanged it will be the duty of the National Committee to issue a call in accordance with them for the election of delegates to the next national convention, and when the delegates have been elected they will be entitled to seats in accordance with those rules. They will constitute the convention. Delegates cannot be elected under one set of rules upon one basis of representation and given or denied seats under some other rule and upon a different basis of representation.

The third duty of the convention is to represent the Republican voters of the state in consulting about the policy to be followed by the party in selecting candidates so that the voters may act effectively at the primary election with a common purpose to secure party success at the regular election. In substance this consultation and any conclusions which we

may reach, any opinions we may express, any advice we may give, will relate to the subject of geographical distribution of candidates. At the coming primary the Republicans of the state are to select candidates for twenty-four offices to be filled by the voters of the entire state. These are: United States Senator, Judge of the Court of Appeals, Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Secretary of State, Comptroller, Attorney-General, State Treasurer, State Engineer and Surveyor, and fifteen delegates-at-large to the constitutional convention. In so large a state as this and with so many offices to fill, it is important to party success that every section of the state shall have the kind of interest in the ticket selected at the primary which comes from having upon it a candidate who is known and trusted in that vicinity; and it is important for government after the election that the officers in the state government and in the constitutional convention shall be in touch with all parts of the state and familiar with the interests and opinions of all the people of the state. It would be unfortunate if all these candidates who are to be selected should prove, as the result of the primary, to be residents of one city or county. Yet something like that might happen if in each place the Republicans were to vote at the primary, as they very naturally might, for residents of their own vicinity, or if the voters of one large place were to vote in that way, while the Republicans of all the rest of the state divided among a great number of candidates. The result of such voting would be that the candidates of the one place which voted solidly for its own residents would have a plurality among a great multitude of candidates while they were really the choice of only a small minority of the Republicans of the state. How to avoid such a result is a serious question. How may these candidates be distributed so that in all parts of the state there will be active personal interest in the success of the Republican

ticket and so that all parts of the state will find real knowledge and comprehension of their needs in the new government. Our opponents will have no such trouble. More than one-half of the normal Democratic vote of the state is cast in the city of New York, and the great mass of those voters, following the directions of their local party organization, will distribute the nominations as that organization directs. The voters in the Republican primary, scattered through sixty-two counties, unbossed, will follow nobody's direction, but will act each according to his own judgment, and it will be necessary that they shall themselves consider what will be the effect of their action in regard to the distribution of candidates. There should be comparatively little difficulty in this respect in making the nominations for the chief offices, the Governor, the United States Senator, and the Judge of the Court of Appeals. The candidates for these offices will naturally be men known throughout the state, and the voters at the primary will probably be affected more by their knowledge of the men and their records than by local considerations.

On the other hand, it seems that it will be quite impossible for the voters to make up a list of fifteen delegates-at-large to the constitutional convention properly distributed through the state without some previous understanding among themselves regarding their action. The voters themselves would not know who were suitable and available candidates in other localities. The voter in Saint Lawrence or Cattaraugus would know very little as to who ought to go to the convention from New York or Brooklyn, and the voter in New York or Brooklyn would have no better knowledge as to who ought to go from Saint Lawrence or Cattaraugus. Men suitable to be delegates-at-large to the convention cannot be expected to make a campaign in order to bring themselves to the knowledge of the voters of the entire state. Men may

do that for the governorship or for the senatorship, but not for the position of delegate to the constitutional convention. The time and effort and expense would be prohibitory. There seems to be no way of reaching a wise result in regard to these offices except for the representatives of the Republican voters who are convened here to ascertain who are available and suitable for delegates-at-large to the convention from all parts of the state, and then advise the Republican voters of the result in the form of a recommendation, leaving the voters to accept as much or as little of the recommendation as they choose.

As to the other state offices, the wise course to follow is more doubtful. It may well be, however, that by simple comparison of views, facilitated by this gathering and without any recommendation from the convention, such unity of action can be obtained that the designation by petition of candidates for those offices to be passed upon at the primary may be so distributed that no unbalanced or injurious result will follow.

There is, however, a broader question presented to all Republican voters by the new primary law — a question upon which the convention itself can take no action, but which the members of the convention ought to consider and discuss here among themselves and with their constituents upon their return to their homes. That question is: What is to be the effect of the primary law upon the cohesion and unity of the party, its capacity for united effort, its possession of a common spirit, the willingness of its members to subordinate minor differences in order to secure the triumph of the principles upon which there is party agreement? Are the bonds of habit, of tradition, of sentiment, of sympathy, of opinion, and of faith, which have held together this great organization, wiser and more competent than any of its

members, and have made it a potent agency for orderly self-government, to be dissolved ?

We are to have a campaign of personal controversy, of personal attack and defense in which great bodies of voters within the party will be arrayed in hostile attitudes toward each other. Whoever is nominated will find a great faction of the Republican voters themselves disposed to be unfriendly to him, possessed of unfriendly opinions regarding him, smarting under defeat. Will they turn around and give him active support ? Will they come out and vote for him ? If they do not, then success at the primary is but a prelude to defeat at the polls, and the primary contest is but a means for the destruction of the party.

The first duty of Republicans is to see to it that no such result shall happen; and to accomplish this two things are necessary. The first is, that every Republican who votes at the primary election shall do so under a sense of honorable obligation to accept and stand by the result whatever it is. No man has any right to vote at a primary unless he is willing to do that. No man can honestly vote at a primary intending to accept the result if he succeeds and to repudiate it if he fails. Somebody must fail, but the good old American way in which our free popular government has been maintained is that the defeated do not sulk or desert or take to the woods; but stand by the result, conscious that other days are to come, and in the cheerful hope that the defeated of today may be the victors of tomorrow. The other necessary thing is, that this primary contest shall be conducted not as between enemies but as between friends, members of the same party and anxious for a common success; with good temper and courtesy, and not with malevolence and denunciation; that no ammunition be manufactured for the enemy; that no wounds be inflicted that cannot be healed, no wrongs done

that cannot be forgiven, no breaches opened that cannot be closed, when the success of the party requires that its members act together.

These things can be accomplished only by the aroused, intelligent, earnest, loyal public opinion of the party, and, unless an appeal can be made with success to that opinion, the primary law will be a failure as a means of expressing the party's will or the party will have proved itself unfit to govern because incapable of self-control.

For the first time in eighteen years the Republican party of the state comes to the election of its state government and its national representatives as the party of opposition both in the state and in the nation. We are about to appeal to the voters of the state for a judgment upon the conduct of government by the Democratic party at Albany and in Washington. I shall not undertake to argue the case which we can make, but briefly to indicate what seem to me some of the most important considerations which form a part of that case.

The Democratic party took possession of the national government a year and a half ago with a program of policy by which they proposed to set free every American from the incubus of too great success by others, to reduce the cost of living, and to give new life and prosperity to American production and commerce, and more ample and certain returns to American industry. Their program has been followed along three main lines relating to the tariff, the financial system, and the control of trusts and corporations. The tariff was to be for revenue only, and by removing protection it was to set free American industry and reduce the cost of living. You know and your constituents know better than I can tell you whether these results have been accomplished. Have the rewards of American industry been increased?

We all know that they have not; but that on the contrary production has been decreased. Many mills and factories have closed or are running but a part of the time. Great numbers of American employees have been thrown out of work. The domestic market which formerly furnished them employment has been to some considerable degree turned over to foreign production. The imports of foreign products for the fiscal year 1914 exceeded those for the preceding year, ending June 30, 1913, to the extent of \$80,917,423; that is to say, nearly \$81,000,000 which would have gone to keep American production active and American workmen employed has been paid to foreign producers. New markets have not been opened abroad to counter-balance this transfer of our purchases, for our exports in the fiscal year 1914 were less than our exports in the preceding year, 1913, by \$101,305,001. So that American production during this past year has been diminished in its foreign market and superseded in its domestic market to the extent of over \$182,000,000. In the meantime the domestic market for our production has been still further diminished because the multitude of workmen who are not employed have lost the greater part of their purchasing power and the producers and the merchants who are making little or no profit are obliged to curtail their expenses.

And yet the cost of living has not been reduced. We all know that it has not. And it seems that if it ever is to be reduced by the working of Democratic policies it will be through the distressing and painful cause that the American people have become wholly unable to pay the cost. Nor has this tariff, for revenue only, been successful as a producer of revenue. The customs revenues of the United States for the fiscal year 1914, with its \$81,000,000 of increased importations, fell short of the customs revenues for the preceding year by \$26,132,740.77.

The American people have many times sustained the policy of protection for American industry by overwhelming majorities; but in the few years which preceded the elections of 1910 and 1912 the people had become impatient with what they believed to be unjust and excessive protection for particular interests. Persistent charges that the high cost of living was due to the tariff, and the spectacle of great wealth amassed in large enterprises had created an impression of protection profitable almost exclusively to the owners and very little to the workmen in our manufactories and mines. The special and expert advocates of the tariff allowed the system to be tried upon its abuses rather than upon its merits. But when the Democratic party came into power it did not attempt to reform abuses of the protective tariff. It repudiated the protective theory altogether and undertook to make a tariff which should not protect. Under the last administration the Republicans in Congress had made an earnest effort to prevent further tariff abuses by reforming the method of making the tariff. They put into the tariff bill of 1909 a provision under which an expert, non-partisan tariff commission was appointed by President Taft and entered upon a careful, thorough, scientific investigation of the facts upon which could be determined, in regard to every branch of production, what would be a fair and reasonable protection based upon the amount of labor entering into the production of each article and upon the comparative conditions at home and abroad. The Congress also passed a further measure, by separate bill, providing for a tariff commission of broader and more specific powers to report to Congress the results of its investigation; but this bill was delayed by a Democratic filibuster in the Senate and then by a Democratic filibuster in the House until the close of the Sixty-first Congress, and the advent of a Democratic House, March 4, 1911, prevented it from becoming a law. Then the

new Democratic House starved the existing tariff commission out of existence by refusing appropriations to enable it to go on with its work. The Democrats who made the present tariff bill scorned the assistance of a tariff commission. They did not care to know what would be reasonable and fair protection because they intended to give no protection. They believed, sincerely, I do not doubt, that the manufacturers, and miners, and farmers who had been maintaining the protective system by their votes for so many years had been receiving undue and unfair advantages by the provisions of the tariff law, and they could not restrain a certain feeling of hostility to the men they had been opposing for so long and to the industries in which those men were engaged. The present tariff was made under the influence of that feeling. Perhaps the time has now come when the American people are ready again to try the protective system upon its merits, and to call for legislation inspired by a spirit of friendship for American industry.

Although eight months have passed since the Banking and Currency Act became a law, it has not yet been put into operation, while the proposed legislation against trusts and corporations has not yet been completed. Those measures, however, have not been without their effect upon the welfare of the country. The various forms in which they have been cast, the discussions upon them, the avowed objects, the unavowed but ill concealed objects, the spirit of the dominant party in dealing with them, all have combined to impress the enterprise of the country with a sense that the government is hostile. Assurances to the contrary do not avail against the general weight of evidence derived from conduct. Where are the new undertakings, the new investment of capital, the new employment of labor, the extensions, the enlargements, the new departures of active enterprise, which should mark the passing years of a vigorous and progressive people in the mid-

course of developing a vast, rich country ? Enterprise hesitates; it waits, irresolute and fearful, because, under the dominance of a party which has shown such jealousy and envy of business success, they are afraid of what government may do to them and to their prospective customers and to their hoped-for opportunities. In this great country, in which practically all production must seek far distant markets and practically all demand must seek far distant sources of supply, the working of the vast and complicated system of industrial exchanges requires great investments and great organizations. The business cannot be done otherwise. Those organizations and those investments halt in doubt. No one knows whether the railroads and steamship lines of the country are to be permitted to earn their interest and dividends. No one knows whether great industrial or commercial organizations, however scrupulously they obey the law, are to be permitted to continue. No one knows when the malice and misrepresentation of a disappointed competitor or the loose declamation of a demagogue may bring the vast new inquisitorial powers of government down to destroy credit and ruin an undertaking. Enterprise halts because it distrusts and fears the Democratic party. In the meantime, while private enterprise is repressed, government control grows. It has been discovered that by graduating the income tax and fixing a high exemption, practically the entire tax may be drawn from the great industrial communities of New England, the Middle States, and the Central West, while the disposition of the money raised by taxation may be determined by the representatives of other parts of the country which have paid none of the tax; so that one set of Americans is to pay the money and another set of Americans is to spend it. Accordingly, there has been in Congress an entire absence of that sense of responsibility for the expenditure of government money which comes from account-

ability to constituents who pay the money. New schemes have been devised to distribute in the places where it will do the most good the money taken from rich states by taxation; \$35,000,000 has been voted to build railroads in Alaska; \$25,000,000 has been voted by the House to be expended upon good roads all over the United States, and that is the prelude to good road schemes running up into the billions. In a multitude of ways the desire is apparent that to prevent the investment of capital from being profitable, to prevent money being made in private enterprise, the government shall step in, secure the capital by taxation, and carry on the business itself. Vast and uncontrolled powers over the life and activity of the American people are being vested in government commissions. The Interstate Commerce Commission has control of the railroads. The Federal Reserve Board is to have control of banks and bankers and of the credits of the country. The Trade Commission is to command the disclosure of the private affairs of all industry, with the tremendous power of blackmail, destruction of credit, and ruin, which that involves. The Internal Revenue Bureau may carry inquisitorial proceedings into the private affairs of every individual. We are rapidly pressing towards the point where if enterprise is to live it must curry favor of government, and thrift must follow fawning.

What wonder that the country begins to look back to the conditions which the Democratic party has been destroying. The years between the census of 1900 and the census of 1910 were the last decade of Republican control. During that period the manufacturing capital of the country increased from \$8,975,000,000 to \$18,428,000,000; the value of manufactured products from \$13,004,000,000 to \$20,672,000,000; the value of the materials used in manufacture from \$6,575,000,000 to \$12,141,000,000; the number of employees engaged in manufacture from 5,076,000 to 7,405,000; the

wages and salaries paid to the employees of manufacture from \$2,730,000,000 to \$4,365,000,000; the exports of the country from \$1,394,000,000 to \$1,744,000,000; the number of savings bank depositors from 6,107,000 to 9,142,000; the amount of their deposits from \$2,389,000,000 to \$4,070,000,-000; the value of farm property from \$20,439,000,000 to \$40,991,000,000. Which party has done the better by the country ?

I shall leave to others the painful task of pointing out the corruption, the profligacy, and the incompetence, which have characterized the government of our state under Democratic control. The people of the state are not ignorant of the way in which the Democratic party has served them. They will long carry the burden of debt which has been put upon them without benefit. And they feel the humiliation of the scandals in Albany and New York. But where have fraud and corruption and theft been hunted down and brought to justice and punished, except where there chanced to be a Republican prosecuting officer ? Why is it that under a long series of Republican state administrations we had honest government and under Democratic administrations we have had waste and graft and a plundered treasury ? It is not because there are not good and honest men in the Democratic party. It is not because there are not bad men in the Republican party. It is because in the Democratic party of the state of New York, taken as a whole, the base and malign influences control and get the better of the honest men, while in the Republican party, as a whole, the honest and patriotic influences control and sustain the honest men. Because the Republican party, as a whole, is fit to govern and the Democratic party, as a whole, is not.

Which party do the people of the state of New York wish to put in power on the first of the coming year ?

In this controversy with the Democratic party the Republican party stands alone. The threat of a third party which alarmed so many Republicans two years ago and still vexed us one year ago has practically disappeared. It is now plain that it never had any real substance apart from the powerful personality of Mr. Roosevelt. This is unmistakably indicated by the statistics of recent enrollments and votes. In Pennsylvania, where 447,426 votes were cast for Progressive electors in 1912, the recent total vote in the Progressive primary was but 46,782, while the Republicans polled in their primaries 96,000 more votes than both the Progressives and Democrats. In California, where there were but scattering Republican votes at the last presidential election, the Republican enrollment exceeds that of either Democrats or Progressives by more than 160,000, and comes within 1,800 of equalling both together. In South Dakota, which gave a 10,000 Progressive majority, a conservative Republican has been nominated for United States Senator by a majority of 9,000. In the Maryland senatorial election the Republican vote increased 18,000 and the Progressive vote decreased 50,000. In the New Jersey state election the Republican vote increased 51,000 and the Progressive vote decreased 104,000. In recent by-elections of Congressmen we find in an Iowa district a Republican gain of 2,000 and a Progressive loss of 11,000. In Maine a Republican gain of 8,000 and a Progressive loss of 6,700. In Massachusetts a Republican loss of 1,900, Democratic loss of 6,000, Progressive loss of 5,500. In West Virginia a Republican loss of 1,700, Democratic loss of 9,000, Progressive loss of 9,500. In Allegheny county, Pennsylvania, where the Republican electors in 1912 received but 24,000 votes, the Republican enrollment is now 127,000. In this state the Republican enrollment exceeds the vote for Republican electors in 1912 by 67,000, and the Progressive enrollment is 278,000 less than

the votes cast for Progressive electors in that year. And it is reported in the public press that the Progressive primaries are to nominate not members of the Progressive party but a selection of Republicans and Democrats for the principal offices to be filled.

Plainly, if the people of the state wish to put an end to Democratic control they must do it by voting for the Republican candidates.

The duty of the Republican party of the state will not be limited to administration. The great changes of our time in industrial and social conditions, the increase of population and wealth, the growth of cities, the magnitude of business enterprise, the interdependence of individual life, have cast new burdens upon government and have made it vastly more complicated and difficult. The essential principles have not changed but the machinery has become overtaxed. Abuses have arisen, and mere faithful administration appears unable to remove them, for the organization of government has become inadequate. These conditions must be dealt with by affirmative, constructive treatment, and that treatment it is the duty and it is the purpose of the Republican party to give.

The most patent difficulty has been in the working of our representative system. It is not peculiar to New York. The legislatures of our states generally have been unable to deal adequately with the problems presented to them. Our American state legislatures were organized to deal with comparatively simple government. Their members were representatives of small, local constituencies with whose affairs they had intimate personal knowledge. The questions which came before them were originally free from complication and within the range of their experience.

All that has changed. The questions with which our legislatures now have to deal involve enormous values, compli-

cated relations, and social problems with which the best thought of the world is struggling. To attain wise action upon such questions intelligent leadership is necessary. That is the invariable rule of human action. Results which require the conjoint action of considerable numbers of men never yet have been successfully attained, and apparently never will be except through the development of some leadership of thought and feeling. That is true in peace as it is in war. It is true in politics, in labor, in sport, in business, upon every occasion which requires many men to act together. There need not be control but there must be leadership. In recent years the real leaders of opinion — the natural leaders, the men competent to lead in politics, in business, and in thought — have not as a rule been members of state legislatures. There are exceptions, but it is true of the system generally that our state legislatures have not contained within themselves the elements of leadership necessary to deal with the great problems of our time. From this lack of capacity for internal leadership there came, in the course of our political development, a system of external leadership of state legislatures. Party leaders from outside the legislature directed legislative operation, and ultimately the one chief party leader exercised sole control over his party votes in the legislature. Not selected by the people, not responsible to them, not subject to the obligations of official station, free from all the limitations which laws have thrown about the exercise of official power, proceeding in private, and accountable to no one for the motives or the influences operating upon him, this extra-constitutional authority came to control the constitutional government of the states.

A popular revolt against the system thus created found its expression in many parts of the country in state constitutions, crowded with limitations upon the power of the legislature, and in the expedient of direct legislation by the people

through the initiative and compulsory referendum. Those expedients have been the outcome of proper and laudable determination to escape from the control of legislatures dominated in the way I have described. They are not, however, the true avenues of escape. They are not progress. They are retrogression. They are not reform. They are abandonment of representative government. They are based upon a surrender of state legislatures to perdition. They concede incapacity of a free, self-governing people to constitute and maintain an honest and competent legislative body. The true remedy is, not to abandon representative government, but to reform our representative system and make it adequate to the demands of our time. To accomplish this the people themselves must give adequate leadership to their legislative bodies and conform the power and procedure of those bodies to the existence of such leadership. Instead of having an unofficial political boss leading our legislature in secret, let the leader of the legislature be elected by all the people of the state, put by law into such relations with the legislative body that his leadership will be exercised in public and lawful procedure, and let the governor of the state be that leader. To have effective government somebody should be responsible for a governmental policy. Let the governor be responsible, subject to the approval or disapproval of the legislature. Let the governor or the heads of his executive departments have seats in the senate and assembly, with the right to explain their policies and the duty to answer questions pertinent to legislation. In place of the inconsiderate, reckless, unregulated, and log-rolling method of piling up appropriations without regard to resources, let us have a definite budget prepared and submitted to the legislature upon the responsibility of the executive, with legislative power to refuse but not to increase or add appropriations. Then log-rolling will cease and economy will become practi-

cable. Then there will be effective power, coupled with responsibility — but not autocratic powers, because the initiative and leadership will be the duty of an officer elected by the people of the state to perform the duty; and because final legislative decision will remain with the legislature itself.

The reflections which arise in considering the relations of the executive and the legislature lead inevitably to another field of reform in state government. That is, the adoption of the short ballot. That is demanded both for the efficiency of our electoral system and for the efficiency of government after election. The tendency of the modern remedies for government evils has been to complicate greatly the business of the voter. The initiative and referendum, and constitutional amendments, and a vast multiplication of offices, municipal, state, and national, have produced enormous ballots and a multitude of names and questions demanding the voter's attention, quite beyond his ordinary capacity. This is now made still worse by the introduction of the Massachusetts ballot, under which the voter cannot accomplish his purpose by simply marking a party column. Even the men most familiar with political affairs find it difficult to act intelligently upon all the names and questions presented by our modern ballots. There is a general and a just feeling that the work of the voter ought to be simplified. It is a general rule that the fewer and simpler the matters which are presented to the voter at the ballot box, the more certainly the voter acts for himself upon his own intelligent judgment, while the more numerous and complicated are the matters presented, the greater is the control of the political manager. The most obvious step towards simplifying the ballot in this state is to have the heads of executive departments appointed by the governor, as they are now by the President of the United States under the national system, instead of having each one separately elected as they are now in this

state. Still more important would be the effect of such a change upon the efficiency of government. The most important thing in constituting government is to unite responsibility with power, so that a certain, known person may be held definitely responsible for doing what ought to be done, to be rewarded if he does it and punished if he does not do it, and that the person held responsible shall have the power to do the thing. Under our system we have divided executive power among many separately elected heads of departments, and we have thus obscured responsibility, because, in the complicated affairs of our government, it is hard for the best informed to know who is to be blamed or who is to be praised; who ought to be rewarded or who punished. At the same time that the governor is empowered to appoint the heads of executive departments and made responsible for their conduct, there plainly ought to be a general reorganization of the executive branch of our government, and the wasteful duplication of effort and the multiplication of offices under a multitude of expensive commissions ought to be obviated by making the regular organization of the executive departments adequate for the performance of their appropriate duties.

As to the third branch of government — the judiciary — the position of the Republican party is clear and firm. It stands for the independence, the dignity, and the authority of the courts. It believes, as our fathers believed, that here is the very citadel of liberty and of justice. It believes that there can be no freedom unless against all private wrong and against all official oppression the weakest citizen can appeal to impartial judicial judgment for the enforcement of those principles of right conduct which have been established in the growth of Anglo-Saxon liberty and have been embodied in the constitutions of these self-governing states. We will support the courts created by the people in the discharge of

their high duty to enforce the principles of justice declared by the people against all officers, however powerful, and against all temporary majorities, however great, for we recognize that there are principles of justice which do not depend upon majorities. If the constitution or the law is wrong we will change it, but so long as it stands we will enforce it, and we are unalterably against every proposal to punish judges by popular recall or to overrule their decisions by popular vote.

In the judicial field, nevertheless, we recognize the need of affirmative reform. The administration of justice should be made more simple, more speedy, more direct, less costly. Complication and intricate technicality of judicial procedure, which have resulted in some part from the inheritance of customs arising in early days under different conditions and in greater part by continual legislative tinkering with the law of procedure, ought to be swept away, the courts ought to be permitted to do justice in a simple and natural way, unhindered by statutory technicalities. There is no sufficient reason why this cannot be done. There is no reason why every honest man should not get his rights without being disheartened by delay or ruined by expense. The reform of procedure may well include making more simple and speedy, less cumbersome and expensive, the proceedings upon the trial of impeachments and in the hearings required for the removal of judges by concurrent resolution. There is no good reason why the testimony in such cases should not ordinarily be taken before a suitable committee in open session and reported to the body which is to render judgment as if it were the testimony in an equity cause, so that only a brief interference with legislative business would be involved.

The Republican party is the party of true reform. It holds fast that which is good and seeks to build up. It maintains the American theory of government, and seeks to liberalize

its application to meet the conditions of the times. It will not change its principles upon the shifting demands of popularity. It conceives true progress to be won by persisting in the hard, slow course of popular self-development and self-government, and not by abandoning the performance of duty and seeking the ends of government through easy experiments without effort and without sacrifice. Upon the proved capacity and sincerity of its past and upon the failure of the opposing party, because it has governed well and the Democratic party has governed ill, the Republican party demands from the people of the state that the powers of government be placed again in its hands.

THE CAMPAIGN OF 1916

ADDRESS AT A PUBLIC MEETING HELD UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
THE REPUBLICAN CLUB, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 5, 1916

THE people of the United States have some serious business to be done by their Government in the next four years and the way in which it is done will be of vital importance to the country and to all of us in the country. Foreign affairs and domestic affairs alike will be critical and difficult; and safety and honor require that these affairs shall be handled upon sound principles of action, with intelligence, resolution, and skill. The great self-governing people are trying to determine now whom they will employ for this business. Shall we engage Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bryan, Mr. McAdoo, Mr. Daniels and the rest of the Democratic Administration and a Democratic Congress to manage our affairs for the next four years?

In considering that question common sense asks: What are the principles by which these gentlemen regulate their conduct in office; with what firmness of character, good sense, and efficiency, have they applied their principles to the practical affairs of the country?

We are told that Mr. Wilson has kept the country out of war. So has every President for seventy years except Lincoln and McKinley. Never since Columbus sighted San Salvador has there been a time when it has been so easy for America to keep out of war by doing nothing as it has been during the great conflict now raging. All the great powers of the world except ourselves have had their hands full with existing enemies. They have been straining every resource to the utmost to avoid being conquered by the enemies already in

arms against them. For each one of them supplies of material and money and moral support from the United States have been earnestly desired and sought because these would be a help in the war now raging. No country has been willing to assume hostile relations with us because that would have the effect of weakening her and strengthening her present enemies. More than that, none of the countries at war has been willing to incur our passive hostility and throw to her active enemies the benefits of our material and moral support, free from the limitations imposed by the law of neutrality. Our danger is not now, while the great war is raging, but later, when peace has been made and the great armies are free and governments look about for ways to repair their losses and the great spaces and ill-defended wealth of the new world loom large on the horizon of their desires. Then will come the pressure of competition backed by force. Then will come the grasping for opportunity, for trade advantage, for territorial foothold, in these new continents where the wealth of the world is concentrating while the old nations are fighting. Then will come the dangers of aggression, small at first, upon plausible pretext, but involving our rights, and then we must maintain our rights or abandon them. Then must be determined whether the Monroe Doctrine has behind it the sincerity and courage of a great nation or is to be surrendered as an idle boast. The North gave up Mason and Slidell because during our Civil War we could not afford to help the South by fighting England, and our Government looked on passively while the republic of Mexico was overturned and the empire of Maximilian established in its place, because we could not afford to help the South by a war with France. But when the war was ended and the armies of Grant and Sherman were free, Sheridan was sent to the border, and before the potentiality of that great army, Louis Napoleon withdrew

from Mexico and began that downward course of diminishing prestige and respect which ended on the battlefield of Sedan. When the old, warring world shall have had its Appomattox and the powers are set free each to pursue its own purposes, the time will come when America will need wisdom and character and power to maintain her peace and at the same time to maintain her rights.

Peace is not maintained by the surrender of just rights, for the presumption of impunity begotten of weak submission to aggression breeds further and still further aggression until at last a humiliated and outraged people plunges into war, which ought to have been wholly unnecessary. Peace is maintained by the assertion of just rights, calmly, reasonably, accompanied by a knowledge of power behind the assertion and a conviction in the minds of others that behind the power are courage and resolution certain to use the power if need be in defense of the right. The actual use of physical power may carry on a war, may win a war, but the certainty that known power will be exercised if need be gives to power its full weight in the preservation of rights without war. That certainty which makes power potent for the peaceful preservation of right is a matter of character. It depends upon the world's judgment of the character of a people and its government. That judgment upon us and our Government, if it is clear in our favor, will be our sure defense in the years to come, while if it is unfavorable, we shall surely suffer.

What will be the attitude in this respect of the nations who covet the wealth and opportunity of the new world when the great war is over, if we return the Wilson administration to power? Will they have a conviction that courage and resolution stand behind the assertion of our rights? Will they believe in the sincerity of our declarations, in the certainty that the great powers of this people will be used to maintain their rights, and that our Government has the

wisdom and skill to use those powers effectively ? There can be but one answer to this question. The Wilson administration has had the opportunity to exhibit its character to the world and it has failed to carry conviction or to command respect. In three fields of major importance affecting international affairs — the three great subjects with which it has had to deal — it has shown itself to be irresolute and incompetent, and that is the judgment of the world. These three are the murder of our citizens on the *Lusitania*, the preparation of military and naval force for national defense, and the ghastly failure in Mexico.

It will be two years this coming winter since Germany gave formal notice of her intention to sink merchant vessels on the high seas without safeguarding the lives of innocent passengers. On the tenth of February, 1915, Mr. Wilson's administration replied that if Germany destroyed American ships or killed American citizens in that way the Government of the United States would hold the German Government to a strict accountability for such acts, and take any steps that might be necessary to safeguard American lives and property, and to secure to American citizens the full enjoyment of their acknowledged rights on the high seas. The words used meant action. They gave notice to Germany that she would carry out her threat at her peril. They met the German threat by an American threat. They committed the Government of the United States clearly to the use of the nation's power for the protection of American citizens on the high seas. Yet Germany paid no attention whatever to the threat. She executed her purpose. She crippled and sank American vessels. She destroyed American lives rightfully travelling on the high seas.

Why did Germany pay no attention to the bold declarations of the American Government ? Because she was ready to fight the United States ? No. Not for a moment. She

ignored the words of the Government of the United States because upon her estimate of the character of the men who controlled the American Government she judged that they had not the nerve, the courage, the resolution, to make their threat good. The Government of Germany judged rightly, as the sequel showed. Germany did what she had threatened to do, and the American Government failed to make good its words. The brave words of our Government about strict accountability were used on the tenth of February, 1915. On the twenty-eighth of March a German submarine torpedoed the passenger steamer *Falaba* and killed an innocent American citizen travelling in the exercise of his undoubted rights. On the twenty-eighth of April a German aeroplane attacked and crippled the American vessel *Cushing*. On the first of May a German submarine torpedoed and sank the American steamer *Gulflight* and killed several Americans travelling of right upon that American ship under the American flag. In the last days of April public notice was given in the American newspapers by the German Ambassador that the same acts for the prevention of which our Government had fruitlessly arrayed the power of the United States with threats of action were to be repeated upon a larger scale by the destruction of the *Lusitania*, then about to sail from America. Nothing was done about that. Nobody made him understand that if this renewed threat was carried out his passports would be handed to him. Nobody made the German Government understand that it could not safely do the thing which it had been told would be at its peril. Nobody made the German Government understand that it could not with impunity despise the power and flout the authority of the United States in its solemnly declared purpose to protect the lives of its citizens on the high seas. And so the *Lusitania* was torpedoed and sunk and one hundred and eleven American citizens — men, women, and children —

whose lives the Government of the United States had solemnly declared it would protect, were slain, and more than eleven hundred other innocent non-combatant passengers were sent to their death in violation of the law of nations and the law of humanity.

Still nothing was done. Immediately upon the shock of the *Lusitania* horror, while all the world waited, expectant, for the Government of this great country to make good its words, we were told and the world was told that America was too proud to fight, and nothing was done, and nothing has ever been done. No one has been held to accountability. A year and more later, after more sinkings of passenger ships and drowning of American passengers, upon the President's declaration to Congress that if such things continued to be done he would be obliged to break off diplomatic relations, Germany suspended her practice of aggression. She may resume it tomorrow. Her statesmen are now discussing the resumption of it. She made no amends for the past and she made no binding promise for the future. No war was needed to protect our citizens. What we needed was a government with the strength of character to do one thing or the other. If our Government did not mean to protect its citizens on the high seas it should have told them that they would not be protected and they could have kept out of danger. But our Government told them that they would be protected. If our Government meant what it said when it declared it would protect its citizens, it should have had the capacity to make Germany understand that it meant what it said, and the *Lusitania* would never have been sunk. But it had not that capacity. It had not the character to make itself believed. From the universal judgment of the world upon that transaction there is no appeal and if we return Mr. Wilson's administration to office we shall be served in all the difficulties of the future by agents discredited in advance — by

agents whose every word is received with a suspicion of insincerity and weakness.

When the full meaning of the events which involved Europe in war became apparent, many Americans saw that the same principles of action which made war in Europe might well in the future be applied on this side of the Atlantic, and, if applied, would require America to be ready to protect her independence and her safety by force of arms. Many Americans demanded that preparation be made against these new conditions which had arisen in the world. The Democratic party would have none of it. The President would have none of it. In his address to Congress on the eighth of December, 1914, he said: the subject "is not new. There is no new need to discuss it. We shall not alter our attitude toward it because some amongst us are nervous and excited." He said: "let there be no misconception. The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of national defense." At that time, after four years of Democratic control of the appropriations of Congress, our navy had sunk to the fourth place among the navies of the world. Practically nothing had been done towards the construction of the few battleships authorized in 1913 and 1914. Our submarine and aerial services were practically non-existent. Our army was below its authorized strength and was not sufficient for the protection even of the Mexican border. In the preceding Congress the Democratic House had passed a bill for a sweeping reduction of the regular army. Fortunately that bill was stopped in the Senate. Mr. Wilson illustrated the attitude and spoke the sentiments of the Democratic party, which for generations had been always opposed to the army and to the navy, not only to their enlargement but to their adequate maintenance. Something more than a year later Mr. Wilson made a tour of the country telling the people of the United States that the world was on fire and they must hurry up and

get ready to fight. He told his audiences that it was imperative to have the regular army greatly increased; that it was imperative to have a volunteer force provided for and trained. He told them the National Guard would not do; that it was not big enough; that it was under state control. He said at Milwaukee:

There are incalculable elements of trouble ahead which we cannot control or alter. I would be derelict to the duty which you have laid upon me if I did not tell you that it was absolutely necessary to carry out our principles in this matter now and at once.

He said at Saint Louis that we must have incalculably the greatest navy of the world. He said at Chicago:

A year ago it did seem as if America might rest secure without any great anxiety and take it for granted that she would not be drawn into this maelstrom. But a year ago was merely the beginning of the struggle. Another year has been added, and now no man can competently say whether the United States will be drawn into the struggle or not.

Yet, a year before that speech, five months had already elapsed since the battle of the Marne. The lines of the great conflict were set, and it was already known throughout the world that the struggle would be long and doubtful and terrible and well-nigh universal. It might not be strange if a college professor, engrossed in the study of books and the instruction of youth, were not to take notice of facts so plain, but it is indeed strange that the President of the United States, with a great State Department at his hand, with ambassadors and ministers and consuls in every part of the earth, reporting by letter and by telegraph — in a position unequalled for information — in a position for which he was selected from among millions and invested with vast executive power under the special duty to exercise vigilance and foresight for his country's protection, should be oblivious to the facts. At last, after more than a year, the President had learned that there was need to discuss the subject of military

and naval preparation; that the country had not been misinformed; that he and his Administration and his party were negligent of national defense; and that the confident and satisfied declarations of his address to Congress on the eighth of December, 1914, were in error. A few months later, Secretary of War Garrison, who had shone as one of the few bright stars among the nebulous incompetencies of the Democratic Administration, resigned from the Cabinet, because the President had shifted his ground again and given his support to the proposition which he had publicly denied, that no force beyond the regular army and the National Guard was necessary for defense. I have detailed all this as the basis for a question, and I ask you, What kind of respect for the effective use of our power will our rivals among the nations have, and what kind of safety for such a use and direction will we have, if we return to office an Administration which nearly two years after its inauguration was so densely and confidently ignorant of the conditions of the military and naval service of our country, and whose foresight of the world conditions required a year and a quarter to mature?

Why is it that our whole available regular army and a large part of the National Guard, many of them ordered away from their homes and their business to their great inconvenience and distress to meet an unexpected emergency, are now engaged in defending the states of Texas and New Mexico against Mexican attacks? How does it happen that on the 20th of June last, the Secretary of State of the United States, in a letter to the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Affairs, found it necessary to make the statements which I shall now read:

The Government of the United States has viewed with deep concern and increasing disappointment the progress of the revolution in Mexico. Continuous bloodshed and disorders have marked its progress. For three

years the Mexican Republic has been torn with civil strife; the lives of Americans and other aliens have been sacrificed; vast properties developed by American capital and enterprise have been destroyed or rendered non-productive; bandits have been permitted to roam at will through the territory contiguous to the United States and to seize, without punishment or without effective attempt at punishment, the property of Americans, while the lives of citizens of the United States who ventured to remain in Mexican territory or to return there to protect their interests have been taken, and in some cases barbarously taken, and the murderers have neither been apprehended nor brought to justice. It would be difficult to find in the annals of the history of Mexico conditions more deplorable than those which have existed there during these recent years of civil war.

It would be tedious to recount instance after instance, outrage after outrage, atrocity after atrocity, to illustrate the true nature and extent of the widespread conditions of lawlessness and violence which have prevailed. During the past nine months in particular, the frontier of the United States along the lower Rio Grande has been thrown into a state of constant apprehension and turmoil because of frequent and sudden incursions into American territory and depredations and murders on American soil by Mexican bandits, who have taken the lives and destroyed the property of American citizens, sometimes carrying American citizens across the international boundary with the booty seized. American garrisons have been attacked at night, American soldiers killed and their equipment and horses stolen; American ranches have been raided, property stolen and destroyed, and American trains wrecked and plundered. . . . So far has the indifference of the *de facto* Government to these atrocities gone that some of these leaders, as I am advised, have received not only the protection of that Government, but encouragement and aid as well.

These conditions are the result of three years and a half of Mr. Wilson's Mexican policy. They are the result of Mr. Wilson's interference in the internal affairs of Mexico. The men against whom our Secretary of State complained so bitterly are the men whom President Wilson put into control in Mexico by using the power of the United States to turn Huerta out and make their revolutionary movement successful.

When Mr. Taft retired from office in March, 1913, the Mexican revolution, through which Madero was overturned and Huerta became president, and the counter-revolution,

headed by Carranza and Villa, had been in progress only twelve days. The time was too short to determine any question of recognition or even to ascertain facts with certainty, and the whole subject was properly left by Mr. Taft to his successor. The new Administration had a clear field to determine and act upon a policy of its own. The ordinary practice of nations under such circumstances is to await the decision of the people of the country itself in favor of one contending faction or the other, and to recognize whichever actually acquires control of the territory and shows itself able to perform the duties of government. The general public declarations of President Wilson were in accordance with that rule of action, for he said to Congress on the twenty-seventh of August, 1913:

We cannot in the circumstances be the partisans of either party to the contest that now distracts Mexico or constitute ourselves the virtual umpire between them.

And he proclaimed the policy of "watchful waiting." In reviewing this policy at Indianapolis, on the ninth of January, 1915, Mr. Wilson said:

When some great dailies not very far from where I am temporarily residing thundered with rising scorn at watchful waiting, Woodrow sat back in his chair and chuckled, knowing that he laughs best who laughs last.

And speaking of the question who should be the governor and what the government of Mexico, he said:

It is none of my business and it is none of your business how long they take in determining it. It is none of my business, and it is none of yours, how they go about the business. The country is theirs. The government is theirs. The liberty, if they can get it, and God speed them in getting it, is theirs. And so far as my influence goes while I am President nobody shall interfere with them.

If the President had adhered to the policy which he thus publicly proclaimed, the contrast might be less shocking now between the appalling conditions exposed in the letter of the

Secretary of State which I have quoted, and the untimely merriment of the Indianapolis speech. But the President's action did not conform to these declarations. His action and his words were startlingly inconsistent. He proclaimed watchful waiting and he engaged in active interference and partisanship. In that very month of August, 1913, when he told Congress that we could not be the partisans of either party to the contest in Mexico or constitute ourselves the virtual umpire between them he had already sent John Lind to Mexico with instructions, saying:

The Government of the United States does not feel at liberty any longer to stand inactively by while it becomes daily more and more evident that no real progress is being made towards the establishment of a government at the City of Mexico which the country will obey and respect.

Then followed a demand to be presented to General Huerta that there should be an immediate cessation of fighting; that security should be given for an early and free election; and that General Huerta should bind himself not to be a candidate for the presidency at that election. In other words, a demand that Huerta should surrender his power and get out. Of course Huerta refused. Curiously enough, bad as he may have been, he and his adherents resented the attempt of the President of the United States to determine the presidential succession in Mexico and exclude him from the office. His government was in possession of the city, the archives, the greater part of the territory of the republic. It had been recognized by substantially all the great powers and most of the smaller powers of the world. He was discharging the international obligations of the Mexican government. The bankers of the great financial cities of the world had loaned thirty million dollars to his government as the Government of Mexico, and he refused to abdicate. On the second of the following December, 1913, the President in a public address to Congress declared:

There can be no certain prospect of peace in America until General Huerta has surrendered his usurped authority in Mexico; until it is understood on all hands, indeed, that such pretended governments will not be countenanced or dealt with by the Government of the United States.

That declaration of course ruined the credit of Huerta's government in the money markets of the world. But Huerta still maintained himself, and on the ninth of the following April, 1914, occurred an incident which was made the occasion for further action on the part of the American Administration. On that day the crew of a boat from the United States steamship *Dolphin*, landing at a pier in the city of Tampico, the use of which had been prohibited without their knowledge, were arrested by the subordinate officer in charge at the pier and detained an hour and a half, until a superior officer was informed and ordered their release. The officer in command at Tampico apologized for what had been done; General Huerta apologized for what had been done; the subordinate officer who had made the arrest was himself arrested and held for punishment. But a formal salute to the flag was demanded as further reparation; and that not being forthcoming, the President ordered the navy to Vera Cruz, the great seaport of Mexico through which the capital is served, and captured and occupied the city. In that capture nineteen American marines were killed and seventy wounded, and the Mexican loss was reported to be one hundred and twenty-six killed and one hundred and ninety-five wounded. At the same time the President applied to Congress for a resolution to justify his course. The resolution adopted by Congress, which was still under discussion when the news of the capture was received, was in these words:

That the President of the United States is justified in the employment of the armed forces of the United States to enforce the demands made upon Victoriano Huerta for unequivocal amends to the Government of the United States for affronts and indignities committed against this Government by General Huerta and his representatives.

In asking for this justification in his address to Congress of April 20, 1914, the day of the capture, the President said:

The people of Mexico are entitled to settle their own domestic affairs in their own way, and we sincerely desire to respect their right. The present situation need have none of the grave implications of interference if we deal with it promptly, firmly, and wisely.

Nevertheless, it was widely believed and widely charged at the time that the flag incident was but a pretext for interference in the civil war then waging in Mexico, and for using the power of the United States to enable Carranza and Villa to overthrow Huerta. And many times the comment has been made that as soon as Huerta had been bottled up by the seizure of his seaport and the interruption of his supplies, the subject of saluting the flag was never heard from again. Proof has now been furnished that the charges made at the time were well founded; that the flag incident was a mere pretext; that the reason for action laid before Congress was not the real reason. That proof comes from President Wilson's own official family. It is a statement by Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior in President Wilson's Cabinet at the time the events occurred and holding the same position in President Wilson's Cabinet now. You can find Secretary Lane's statement in the Congressional Record for July 21, 1916, at page 13207. It is as follows:

Meanwhile the revolution had gained such headway in the north that it was difficult from day to day to say which had or occupied the greatest portion of Mexican territory. Huerta was keeping up his resistance because he was being supplied with ammunition from abroad. A ship was reported ready to land at Vera Cruz with a cargo of arms, and as a warning to Huerta and in proof of the seriousness of our purpose to bring Huerta to a recognition of our attitude, the order was given to seize the custom house and occupy the port of Vera Cruz.

We did not go to Vera Cruz to force Huerta to salute the flag. We did go there to show Mexico that we were in earnest in our demand that Huerta must go, and he went before our forces were withdrawn. . . . We had gone to Vera Cruz "to serve mankind." Our only quarrel was with Huerta, and Huerta got out on July 16, 1914.

And so, proclaiming impartiality and respect for the right of Mexico to settle her own affairs, President Wilson interfered in the civil controversy in Mexico, and finally intervened by force of arms and destroyed one party and aided the other party and overthrew Huerta and set up Carranza and Villa in the control of government there. He has had his way in Mexico and he has managed it with such a degree of skill that both Villa and Carranza are our enemies; that no man in Mexico dares call himself our friend, and that the Secretary of State is constrained to write the letter which I have quoted. I wonder if the President laughed when he read that letter and contemplated the results of his extraordinary "watchful waiting", modified by active interference?

The question for the American people now is, Are they willing to have the serious and critical affairs in which their vital interest will be concerned during the next four years conducted in the same way that the Mexican business has been conducted?

There is one particular subject with which the United States must deal in order to meet the revulsion in production and trade which will accompany the close of the great war. That is the tariff. I think there is very general agreement upon that. When the demand for supplies to the armies in the field has ended, great numbers of men will return to productive employment in Europe, and great numbers of operatives will be thrown out of employment here and will have to find other work. Europe will have little money and will be heavily in debt. She will be under strong compulsion to pay her debts by making and selling goods. She will be on a basis of strict economy and high organization and she can make and sell cheaply. The United States will have an abundance of money and vast purchasing power. Our market has always been attractive to European producers. It will be far more attractive after the war. It is highly prob-

able that even England will resort to a protective tariff, so that our production will meet protective barriers in all the foreign markets. What are we going to do then? We must do something. We must protect ourselves or we shall become the dumping-ground of the world and our workmen will beg in the streets. Even the Democrats have seen that something must be done, for they have provided a tariff board to ascertain and report the true facts to which a tariff law is to be applied. When they made a tariff at the beginning of the Wilson administration they were very contemptuous about tariff boards. They would have none of them. In Mr. Taft's administration the Republicans provided for a tariff board to report to the President and it was appointed and doing excellent work. When the Democratic House, elected in 1910, came in they starved it out of existence by refusing appropriations. In the last session of the Sixty-first Congress the Republicans passed through both Houses a new bill for a tariff board to report to Congress. There were some slight differences of detail in the two Houses, which were agreed upon in conference, but the Democrats filibustered against the final conference report and so killed the bill. So the tariff board was dead — slain by the Democratic party. It has now been resurrected by that party because they see that something must be done about the tariff when the war closes. Even my friend Senator Stone of Missouri has seen the light about dye-stuffs. Coming from Missouri he has been shown in some way that dye-stuffs must be protected. He is still faithful to the old flag of tariff for revenue only, but he votes for a protective tariff on dye-stuffs because he says he sees no other way to protect them. Now we can all understand that if the country wants a tariff for revenue only they may put the making of it in the hands of the Democratic party. But can any sane man contemplate that party making a protective tariff?

In the first place they cannot do it honestly. They do not believe in it. They were born and bred in a different faith. Way back in 1856 the Democratic platform declared for "progressive free trade throughout the world", and four years later, in 1860, their platform contained this provision:

We, the Democracy of the Union, in convention assembled, hereby declare our affirmance of the resolutions unanimously adopted and declared as a platform of principles by the Democratic convention in Cincinnati in the year 1856, believing that Democratic principles are unchangeable in their nature when applied to the same subject matters.

Their principles are indeed unchangeable enough about the tariff to make it impossible for them to apply the principle of protection fairly and honestly to the making of a tariff. That opposition has run through all their history. In 1876 their platform says:

We demand that all custom house taxation shall be only for revenue.

In 1880 they declared for "a tariff for revenue only." In 1892 their platform says:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only.

In 1904 they say:

We denounce protectionism as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the government, economically, effectively, and constitutionally administered.

In 1912 they say again:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue.

And in their platform of this present year they declare:

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the government economically administered, and unreservedly indorse the Underwood tariff law as truly exemplifying that doctrine.

There is the position of the Democratic party. They have been crying so long that protection is an abuse of power and an abomination that they cannot reconcile themselves to a protective tariff, and they regard the Underwood tariff as a model. That is what we are to have if the Democrats go back — the Underwood tariff still, with perhaps here and there a slight modification regarding dye-stuffs and some other articles which can be shown to gentlemen from Missouri and elsewhere.

Well, if there ever was a clumsy, ill-conceived, misfit law, it is the tariff which bears Mr. Underwood's name. We had already discovered what its effect was when the war in Europe began. During the year ending June 30, 1914, under that tariff our imports of foreign products were \$80,917,423 greater and our exports to foreign markets were \$101,305,-001 less than in the preceding year under the Republican tariff. So that American production during that year was diminished in its foreign market and superseded in its domestic market to the extent of over \$182,000,000. At the same time the revenue from customs duties for the year 1914, with its eighty odd million of increased imports, fell short of the customs revenue of the preceding year by \$26,132,740.77. Many mills and factories were closed or running but a part of the time. Great numbers of laborers were thrown out of employment and the market for American products was still further reduced by the destruction of their purchasing power. Enterprise halted, discouraged and apprehensive of the future. New enterprises were no longer attempted. Old plants were no longer enlarged. The Underwood tariff had already failed when the war in Europe began. That war furnished and continues to furnish to American production the most absolute protection, because it has to so great a degree stopped production in Europe. So long as the war lasts our producers have practically no competition in our

home market, for Europe does not make the goods to sell here. At the same time, while the war lasts our producers have an enormous market in Europe for the things that Europe cannot produce in sufficient quantities. When the war is over that condition will cease, and we shall deserve what happens to us if we do not provide against that time by a tariff quite different from the Underwood tariff, and made by men who do not consider a tariff for revenue only an article of religious faith.

There is another grave matter which should influence the selection of a new government. That is the surrender of the President and Congress to the peremptory demand of the four railroad brotherhoods for the increase of their wages by a law passed under threats.

To say that the demand of the brotherhoods or the law passed in response to that demand involved the question of an eight-hour day for labor is a manifest subterfuge. There was no demand or suggestion that the labor of the engineers, firemen, conductors, and trainmen included in the four brotherhoods should be limited to eight hours a day. There was nothing in the law limiting their labor to eight hours a day. There was no penalty and no prohibition against exceeding that number of hours. Everybody knew that a strict eight-hour schedule of labor was inapplicable in fact to service upon railroad trains where speed and distance so largely control length of service, and nobody proposed to apply any such schedule to that business. What happened was that the brotherhoods demanded, not shorter hours of labor but that in computing their pay eight hours should be assumed as a day's work and they should have the same pay for eight hours that they had been getting for ten, with extra pay for the additional time above eight hours. The railroad companies offered, in computing the pay, to assume eight hours as the basis but refused to allow the full ten hours' pay

for eight hours' service, with extra pay for the additional time and they offered to arbitrate the question as to what amount of pay the brotherhood men ought to receive for their service on the eight-hour basis. The question thus became a question of the amount of pay, pure and simple. The universal opinion of our country has been that such questions ought to be settled by arbitration. Labor has been in favor of that. The most intelligent and broadminded employers have been for that. Disinterested citizenship has been for that. Arbitration of industrial disputes has been gradually developing into a custom of the country, just as our system of law has developed through customs, answering the needs and enforced by the public opinion of the community. Where the participants in any industry are rendering a public service there is a special reason and a special necessity for such peaceable settlement of industrial disputes. In an ordinary business a strike is a contest between a laborer's need to earn a living and an employer's need to continue a profitable business. They only are directly involved. But where there is a public service the whole people are involved. If the service stops they suffer, and they have a right to insist that no controversy between the employer and the employed shall stop a service necessary to the continuance of the life of the community. The only way yet discovered to prevent that is the settlement of such industrial disputes by arbitration. The brotherhoods refused arbitration and insisted upon the immediate granting of their demands, whereupon the President recommended the passage of a law granting their demands. A bill was introduced in Congress and while it was under discussion the brotherhoods gave notice to the Government that unless the bill was passed by Saturday night they would stop the entire railroad transportation of the country. Under the compulsion of that threat, the bill was passed by Saturday night and is on the statute books of

the United States. No inquiry was made and there was no pretense of forming an opinion in Congress as to whether the demand was justified and the wages demanded ought to be paid. You and I do not know whether the demand was justified. The people of the United States do not know whether it was justified. Congress did not know whether it was justified. The legislation was passed in submission to a threat. The brotherhoods, four hundred thousand in number, had in their hands the power to injure the community by stopping transportation, and the Government of the United States submitted to them. It was a hold-up, pure and simple. Do not for a moment think that this was merely a question between railroad corporations and the men who run their trains. It passed far beyond that. The railroad companies render an absolutely necessary public service. If it stops, business stops, and ruin and starvation begin. The railroad brotherhoods include only about one-fifth of the employees of the railroad companies. How about the other four-fifths? Are they not equally entitled? They are not so well paid as the brotherhood. The majority of the brotherhood are already receiving greater compensation than the average of the clergymen, the teachers, the lawyers, the doctors, of the country. Why should not the other four-fifths hold up the Government upon a demand for higher wages? They also are able to stop transportation. For all that the Government of the United States knows, the four-fifths not included in this legislation ought to have their wages increased and the one-fifth ought not to have them increased. The difference is not one of ascertained rights, but that the one-fifth has exercised the power of compulsion and the four-fifths have not.

But if the railroad rates are now justly fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon these enormous increases of pay to their employees the railroads must increase these rates, and shippers and passengers must pay more, and the

whole public must pay more; for into the cost of practically every material thing that we use in life enters the cost of transportation. The higher the cost of transportation, the higher must be the price we pay for everything transported. So, in the end, the public pays and the question is, are the people of the United States to be held up by a compact, organized minority?

There is a broader question here than the payment of higher railroad rates. There is the question of the competency of government and the spirit of a self-governing people. If the government of this democracy is to submit to compulsion by an organized minority, and the people are to approve by their votes, other minorities will profit by the example. There are a multitude of ways in which the coercion of the community through its necessities is practicable, if coercion be permitted. If the attitude of our Government under the compulsion of the railroad brotherhoods is to be the attitude of the American people, we hold our lives at the mercy of the public blackmailer. The peace and order and prosperous life of the community are impossible under such conditions. The organization of civil society which regulates the rights and duties of its members towards each other upon the basis of ascertained justice, will have failed, as it has failed in Mexico. The only way to prevent the example of the surrender of government to the compulsion of the railroad brotherhoods from being followed by others, is to condemn it and to condemn it now. The way is to respond now to that evil example with so clear a note of the courage and independent character of American citizenship that never again will any band or organization or class of men attempt to extort money from the American people by threats of injury, rather than by the established justice of their cause.

The conduct of life by individuals and of public affairs by political parties is not wholly nor chiefly controlled by the

events and impulses of the hour. Overruling all, the spirit of the man's life and the party's life determines the attitude and the action with which the exigencies of successive years are met. The weakness of the Democratic party, and the legislators and executives by whom it is represented in the government of our country, is that the Democratic party is national only in form and profession. It does not think nationally. It does not feel nationally. Its acts are not inspired by the spirit of American nationality. During all its history, it has been a party of confederated local interests, mainly solicitous to preserve and advance those interests by the exercise of such power as it could acquire in the National Government. It has been the party of strict construction of the Constitution and opposition to the exercise of power by the National Government. It has been the party of state rights and jealousy of the power of the National Government. At every step of the expanding power of our nation it has played the part, not without occasional usefulness, of objection and resistance; of criticism and condemnation. It denied the right of the nation to make internal improvements. It denied the right of the nation to establish a national bank. It denied the right of the nation to restrict the expansion of slavery. It denied the right of the nation to prevent the secession of states. It denied the right of the nation to issue greenbacks. It denied the right of the nation to maintain a protective tariff. Observe the language of the Democratic platform of four years ago:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue.

The harsh experience of reconstruction imposed by national power upon the South, where the control of the Democratic party lies, and the inveterate habit of opposition to government acquired during the long years of Republican

ascendancy, have preserved and emphasized the traditions and sentiments of the Democratic party's past. And now, as ever, the first thought, the first solicitude, the inspiring motives, are to be found in their state interests, their local interests, their neighborhood interests; second to these and subordinate to them is their acceptance of the majestic conception of the nation.

When the Democratic Congress rejected Secretary Garrison's plan for a national citizen force to supplement the regular army and substituted the absurdly inadequate provision for bringing in the National Guard of the states; and when the President, abandoning his former position, went with the Democratic Congressmen, and the Secretary resigned, it was because the Democratic party clung to the local privilege of the appointment of the officers of the militia by the governors of their states and was unwilling that the officers of the great national force upon which we must depend if war comes, should be appointed by the National Executive. That attitude would have been impossible if the Democratic party had been actuated and inspired by the spirit of American nationality and had thought first of the competency and power of the nation in arms.

When Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan permitted their Mexican policy to be controlled by an enthusiasm, however generous, for the political fortunes of the Indians of Mexico, and interfered in the internal affairs of that country for the purpose, as Mr. Wilson himself has told us, of giving the eighty per cent "a look in" in the government of that country, and turned a deaf ear to the forty thousand American citizens who were appealing in peril and distress for protection, they somehow failed not merely in judgment, not merely through being misinformed and deceived as to the true nature of the civil strife in Mexico and the men engaged in it, but they failed in the spirit of their work. The spirit that has made

America great and free was not in them. Listen to the words of Secretary Evarts, written to Minister Foster in Mexico thirty-eight years ago:

The first duty of a government is to protect life and property. This is a paramount obligation. For this governments are instituted, and governments neglecting or failing to perform it become worse than useless. . . . Protection in fact to American lives and property is the sole point upon which the United States are tenacious.

The imminent, deadly peril of the Americans in Mexico was not a mere question of property or of human life. It was a question of national duty and honor and right to existence; for a nation that is indifferent to the oppression and destruction of its citizens anywhere on earth has already begun to die. The President was charged by his office and his oath to perform that duty for the nation which trusted him. But he forgot it. The oppressed and imperilled Americans were to him no more than were Mexican peons. He was indifferent to them. He recognized no duty towards them. He interfered in the affairs of Mexico, not for their protection but in aid of what he supposed to be a movement for the redistribution of land and of political power among the people of Mexico. The Secretary of State has recorded the result in the letter from which I have quoted. The President is proud of this. He tells of it himself. How does it happen that a sentimental interest in an uplift movement in Mexico was stronger than the desire to perform the duty of our nation towards its citizens ? It was because the spirit of American nationality — the spirit that has made America great and honored — was not in the President nor his Secretary of State, nor the Democratic Congress which stood behind them. That is the fundamental reason why the brave words of the message to Germany before the *Lusitania* was sunk failed to bite into the consciousness of the German Government and prevent the outrage. That is the real reason why

the arrogant demand of the railroad brotherhoods upon the Government of the United States, under threat of injury, was not resented and repelled, and the whole force of this nation rallied in defense of its right to govern itself free from compulsion.

The terrible power of a great nation in earnest clears a way for itself and maintains rights and accomplishes just purposes with no need for physical force. But if the spirit is wanting, neither fine words nor skillful argument nor sentiment can take its place.

The most precious possession of the American people is not in our cities and palaces, our railroads and factories, our rich mines and fertile farms; for we may have all these and lose our own soul. The supreme necessity of our life is the spirit that bore up our fathers in their poverty and struggles; the spirit that inspired them in the great empty spaces of the new world with the conception of a self-governing republic, bound together by the universal devotion of her sons, instinct with the high and unhesitating courage of liberty, honored for justice, leading the world towards the better things of freedom. The spirit is not gone. It has been sleeping. It has been overlaid by wealth and prosperity and ease. What America now needs most of all is that she may be revealed again in the hearts of her people; that they may realize their love of country; that their patriotism may be quickened; that they may be ready again to live for her honor and die for her duty as their fathers lived and died, and as millions of men are living and dying now for their countries on those sad battlefields of the old world.

I have lived a long life, and, please God, will die in the company and faith of the Republican party. I have not been blind to its faults nor silent about them. But from away back among the dim impressions of childhood there come to me now and then the voices of women praying that God's

infinite wisdom might save this nation for freedom through the trials of bleeding Kansas and Nebraska. Among the memories of half-comprehending and half-forgotten boyhood are the sounds of marching men and the strong, wrathful words of those who bore up the hands of great-hearted Lincoln, agonizing for his country, against those who thought this nation not worth preserving. During all the years since then, whenever the stress of trial pressed through the surface of prosperous life to the hard substratum of conviction and sense of national duty, I have found the men whose aroused conscience and patriotism urged them to stand for the financial honor, the industrial independence, the moral integrity, the fidelity to duty to our country, seeking their object chiefly through the organized power of the Republican party. I believe in spiritual succession, in the transmission of faith from generation to generation, in the ennoblement of reverence for great examples, in the purification of life by ideals, in the love of country that subordinates lesser motives; and I believe that if the real prosperity and honor of America are to be preserved, if the soul of America is to be saved for her mission of the future, it must be through the leadership of that great organization which, in its birth and its life, its victories and its defeats, its convictions and its impulses, is and always has been national to the core.

And, with cheerful hope, I recognize as the true inheritor and interpreter of that ancient spirit which has made America what she is, the strong, true and tried American gentleman whom we are about to make the twenty-ninth President of the United States — Charles Evans Hughes.

INDEX

INDEX

Acton, Lord, British historian, 72, note.
Africa, 21, 29, 36, 39, 54, 75.
Airships, 17, 329.
Alaska, 313.
Alaskan Boundary dispute, the, 200.
Alaskan islands, the, 289.
Albany, New York, 208, 272, 275, 308.
Albany investigations, the, 266.
Alexander the Great, 34.
Algeciras, Conference at, 240.
Allegheny county, Pennsylvania, 315.
American Bar Association, the, resolutions of, 63 f.; address on the American bar and the war, 57-62; address at the Banquet of, 169-182.
American Club, the, at Petrograd, address at, 136-141.
American Federation of Labor, the, 120.
American Revolution, the, 134, 177.
American Sugar Refining Company, the, 270, 271, 285.
America's present needs, address on, 11-26.
Anarchists, 156, 163, 175.
Andrew, John Albion, American statesman, 279.
Anthracite coal mines, proposed government ownership of, 191.
Anti-rebate act, the, 209, 212.
Anti-trust Law, the, 280.
Appomattox, surrender at (1865), 325.
Arabic, the, 78.
Arbitration, 71; general treaties of, 237 f.
Arbuckle Brothers, 271.
Army, the, 288, 329 f.
Arthur, Chester Alan, American president, 279.
Asia, 21, 24, 29, 36, 39, 54, 75.
Assassination, 222 ff., 226.
Atlanta penitentiary, the, 272.
Atlantic Ocean, the, 289, 329.
Australasia, 21, 29.
Australia, 232.
Austria, 16, 21, 71, 95.
Autocracy, principle of, in conflict with democracy, 41, 60, 79, 95, 160.
Bagdad, 93.
Balance of power, the, 22, 71, 75.
Balance of trade, the, 290, 340.
Balkans, the, 26.
Bank deposits, guarantee of, 251-254.
Bankers' Club, address at the, 81-86.
Banking and Currency Act, the, 311.
Barbarians, overthrow Rome, 34.
Baser motives of mankind, appealed to by Germany, 49, 84 f.
Battleship fleet, voyage of the, around the world, 232.
Beef Trust, the, 210, 211 f.
Belring Sea arbitration, the, 289.
Belgians, 22; address on the enslavement of the, 3-9; Belgian relief work, 107, 119.
Belgium, 20, 21, 25, 26, 36, 37, 40, 49, 60, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 78, 107, 119, 179, 181, 182.
Berlin, 93.
Bertron, Samuel R., member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92.
Bielostok, 224.
Bill of Rights, the, 292, 294.
Bismarck, Prince Otto von, German statesman, 53, 76.
Bissing, Moritz Ferdinand, Baron von, German general, 4.
Black race, the, 190.
Blaine, James Gillespie, American statesman, 194, 279.
Boers, the, 50.

Bonaparte, Charles Joseph, secretary of the navy, 221.

Bosporus, the, 21, 22.

Bourbons, the, 38.

Bourse of Moscow, the, address before, 127 ff.

Boxer rebellion, the, 238.

Boycott, Chinese, against American goods, 238.

Brandenburg, 74.

Brazil, 193.

British colonies, the, 50, 84.

British Guiana, 193.

Brooklyn, New York, 305.

Brooklyn Cooperage Company, the, 270.

Brusiloff, Alexis, Russian general, 130, 145.

Bryan, William Jennings, American secretary of state, 190, 198, 199, 323, 346; candidate for the presidency, 243-247.

Buchanan, Sir George, British diplomat, 134.

Buchanan, James, American president, 188, 195.

Budget system, the, 318 f.

Buffalo, New York, address at, 185-201.

Buffon, Comte de, French naturalist, 72, note.

Bunker Hill, battle of (1775), 17.

Bureau of Corporations, the, 209, 213.

Bureau of Mines, the, 286.

Butler, Nicholas Murray, American educator, 265.

Caesar, 223.

California, 315.

Cameroniens, the, 26.

Campaign funds, use of, 243 f.

Canada, 194, 238.

Cannon, Joseph Gurney, American congressman, 221.

Canton, Ohio, 185.

Capitol, the, 17, 198.

Caribbean Sea, the, 22, 29, 30, 36, 40, 53, 76, 239.

Carranza, Venustiano, Mexican chief, 333, 336, 337.

Cattaraugus county, New York, 305.

Caucasus, the, 146.

Cavell, Edith, English nurse, 181.

Central America, 22, 36, 240.

Certainty, value of, in business, 128 f.

Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, address at the, 161-167.

Charles I, king of England, 223.

Chesapeake Bay, 17.

Chicago, 185, 257, 277, 330.

Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway Company, the, 271.

Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railway Company, the, 271.

Child labor, 236.

Children's Bureau, the, 286.

China, 23, 34, 200, 238, 239.

Chinese students, to be educated in the United States, 238.

Cloote, Joseph Hodges, American lawyer and diplomat, 220, 265.

Cincinnati, Ohio, 339.

Civil War, the, 15, 16, 31, 47, 165, 177, 189, 195, 196, 283, 324.

Cleveland, Grover, American president, 196-199, 222, 258.

Coal combination, the, 211.

Coal lands, 234 f., 287.

Cohen, Julius Henry, 57.

Coliseum at Chicago, address at the, 65-80.

Colonies, contention for, 75 f.

Columbus, Christopher, 323.

Common law, the, 209.

Congress of Constructive Patriotism, address at the, 11-26.

Conscription, value of, 16.

Conservation of natural resources, the, 280, 287.

Constituent Assembly, proposed, in Russia, 90, 129, 140.

Constitution, the, 65 f., 70, 128, 188, 189, 190 f., 195, 243, 244, 245, 263, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 298, 345.

Corday, Charlotte, French heroine, 223.

Corporate wealth, increase of, 205.

Corporations, political problems connected with, 205-214.

Cortez, Hernando, 17.

Cossacks, 175.

Council of Ministers, the, address to, 98-101.

Crane, Charles Richard, member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 66.

Criminals, release of, in Russia, 163 f.

Crisp, Charles Frederick, American congressman, 247.

Cromwell, Oliver, 223.

Cuba, 193, 199, 231, 239.

Cushing, the, 327.

Cutting, Robert Fulton, American philanthropist, 220.

Czolgosz, assassin, 223, 224.

Daniels, Josephus, secretary of the navy, 323.

Dardanelles, the, 30.

Debased currency, 195 f.

Decadence, occasioned by luxury, 8, 11, 34, 180, 348.

Declaration of Independence, the, 20, 89, 94, 102, 133 f.

Demagogue in politics, address on the, 203-226.

Democracy, principle of, in conflict with autocracy, 41, 60, 85, 95, 160.

Democratic party, the, 41 ff.; the campaign of 1904, 185-201; of 1906, 203-226; of 1908, 227-258; of 1910, 259-275; opposes Republican measures, 282, 283, 286, 288 f.; the campaign of 1914, 301-322; of 1916, 323-349.

Denmark, 237.

Denver convention, the, 245.

Department of Agriculture, the, 233-236.

Department of Commerce and Labor, the, 236, 290.

Department of Justice, the, 212, 233, 284.

Department of State, the, 290, 330.

Department of the Interior, the, 233 f., 235.

Deportation of the Belgians, 4.

Dewey, George, American admiral, 53.

Dick Act, the, 15.

Dietrich, German admiral, 53.

Dingley Tariff Act, the, 194, 238, 250.

Discussion as related to the war, address on, 65-80.

Disraeli (Earl of Beaconsfield), 223.

District of Columbia, the, 211.

Dix, John Alden, governor of New York, 269, 272-275.

Dolphin, the, 335.

Drug Trust, the, 210.

Duma, Russian, 89 ff., 162, 170.

Duncan, James, member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92, 120.

Dye-stuffs, 338, 340.

Eldon, Lord, British jurist, 209.

Elevator combination, the, 210.

Elkins anti-rebate law, the, 209, 212.

Employers' Liability act, the, 214, 285.

England, 16, 21, 22, 31, 37, 38, 42, 43, 49, 50, 72, 75, 79, 84, 107, 119, 156, 182, 209, 223, 237, 324, 338. *See* Great Britain.

English Channel, the, 21.

Eric Railroad, the, 257.

Europe, 20, 24, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 61, 64, 71, 72, 75, 78, 84, 94, 143, 144, 177, 223, 240, 329, 337, 340, 341.

Everts, William Maxwell, American secretary of state, 347.

Extra-constitutional authority, revolt against, 317 f.

Fairbanks, Charles Warren, American vice-president, 221.

Falaba, the, 78, 327.

Federal contractors' eight-hour labor law, the, 214.

Federalist, *The*, 294.

Federal Reserve Board, the, 313.

Fertilizer Trust, the, 211.

Fiat money, 195.

Filipinos, the, 186 f., 199 f., 231.

Finland, 89.

Flame throwers, 17.

Flanders, 52.

Flax industry, the, in Russia, 178.

Flint, Charles Ranlett, Mr. Root's letter to, 95 f.

Florida, 14, 189.
 Forest policy, 234.
 Foster, John Watson, American diplomat, 347.
 France, 13, 16, 21, 26, 30, 31, 37, 38, 42, 43, 52, 68, 69, 72, 73, 75, 77, 84, 107, 119, 147, 156, 173, 179, 182, 223, 237, 238, 324.
 Francis, David Rowland, American diplomat, 91, 98.
 Fraternization, 48, 131.
 Fraudulent land entries, 235.
 Frederick II (the Great), king of Prussia, cynical philosophy of, 72 f., 74, 75, 81 f., 84.
 Free coinage of silver, 196, 283.
 Fugitive Slave Law, the, 189.
 Fur seals, 289.
 Gambling, 229.
 Garfield, James Abram, American president, 279, 303.
 Garrison, Lindley Miller, secretary of war, 331.
 Gas, in warfare, 17.
 General Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, the, 118.
 General Staff Headquarters, address at, 130 f.
 Genghis Khan, 73, 159.
 Geological Survey, the, 235, 287.
 Gerard, James Watson, American diplomat, 30 f.
 Germany, 16, 21, 47 f., 49-55, 60 f., 65, 84 f., 95, 110, 114 f., 127, 144, 145, 147, 150 f., 156 f., 159, 166, 173, 180, 238; enslaves the Belgians, 3-9; not impressed by President Wilson's notes, 326-329, 347; makes war on America, 27-38; declaration of war against, 39-44.
 Gettysburg, battle of (1863), 17.
 Gilder, Richard Watson, magazine editor, 221.
 Glennon, Rear-Admiral James Henry, member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92.
 Goebel, William, 222.
 Gold standard, the, 196.
 Gorman, Arthur Pue, American senator, 198, 199.
 Grant, Ulysses Simpson, American president and general, 279, 324.
 Grazing lands, public, unlawfully enclosed, 235.
 Great Britain, 14, 71, 134, 173, 193, 289.
See England.
 Great Lakes, the, 238.
 Greenbacks, 195, 345.
 Grey, Sir Edward, British minister, 49.
Gulflight, the, 78, 327.
 Hague, The, conferences at, 71; First, in 1899, 5; Second, in 1907, 237.
 Hague Convention, the, 4 f.
 Hague Tribunal, the, 200, 238.
 Haiti, 53.
Hale v. Henkel, 217.
 Hamilton, Alexander, American statesman, 206, 294.
 Hapsburgs, the, 96.
 Harlan, John Marshall, American jurist, 294.
 Harriman, Edward Henry, American financier, 272.
 Harrison, Benjamin, American president, 193, 279.
 Harvester Company, the, 285.
 Havana, 222.
 Hay, John, secretary of state, 221.
 Hayes, Rutherford Birchard, American president, 279.
 Hearst, William Randolph, newspaper publisher, 204, 215-226.
 Highlands, the, 26.
 Hoar, George Frisbie, American senator, 279, 303.
 Hohenzollerns, the, 72, 74, 96.
 Holland, 75.
 Honduras, 193.
 Hoover, Herbert Clark, 107, 119.
 House of Representatives, rules of the, 245 ff.
 Huerta, Victoriano, Mexican revolutionary president, 332, 334-337.
 Hughes, Charles Evans, address of, 45;

governor of New York, 206 f., 208, 213, 215, 218, 225, 227, 265, 266, 267, 275; candidate for the presidency, 349.

Huguenots, the, 26.

Humbert-Bazile, French writer, 72, note.

Huppuch, W. A., 274.

Ice combination, the, 211.

Illinois, 257.

Imperialism, 254 f.

Income tax, 284, 312.

Indiana, 199.

Indianapolis, President Wilson's speech at, 333, 334.

Indians, American, 14, 17; of Mexico, 346.

Industrial organization, importance of, 18.

Industrial Workers of the World, the, 156, 163, 174.

Initiative and referendum, the, 318.

Insurance investigation, the, 206 f.

International law, *see* Law of nations.

Internationals, the, 156, 157.

Interstate Commerce Commission, the, 191, 272, 284, 286, 313, 343.

Iowa, 315.

Irish, the, 143.

Irrigation, 190, 191, 200, 234, 235.

Ishii, Viscount, Japanese diplomat, 81, 85, 86.

Isthmian Canal, the, 194.

Italia Irredenta, 49, 179.

Italy, 26, 37, 49, 79, 84, 107, 119, 156, 173, 182, 237.

Jackson, Andrew, American president, 188.

Japan, 30, 78, 238, 239, 240, 289; address on Japan and the United States, 81-86.

Jefferson, Thomas, American president, 256 f.

Jerome, William Travers, American lawyer, 220.

Johnson, Andrew, American president, 198.

Judicial power, importance of the, 262 f., 320 f.; reform needed in the administration of justice, 321.

Justice, divine principle of, 293.

Kansas, 189, 349.

Kent, James, American jurist, 209.

Kerensky, Alexander, Russian minister, 48, 119, 132, 176.

Kishineff, 224.

Knox, Philander Chase, American senator, 221.

Kosciusko, Tadeusz, Polish patriot, 182.

Kultur, 74.

Land thieves, 233.

Lane, Franklin Knight, secretary of the interior, 336.

Las Cases, Comte de, French historian, 94.

Latin America, 239.

Law of nations, the, 52, 71, 72, 75, 106, 151, 328.

Leadership, necessity of, 317.

Lehigh Valley Railroad, the, 257.

Lincoln, Abraham, American president, 7, 41, 42, 195, 206, 224, 227, 279, 295, 323, 349.

Lind, John, personal representative of President Wilson, 334.

Lotteries, 233.

Louisiana, 43, 189.

Louis Napoleon, emperor of France, 324 f.

Low, Seth, American educator, 265.

Lower California, 30, 36.

Lumber combination, the, 210.

Lusitania, the, 78, 326, 327, 328, 347.

Luxemburg, 71.

Luxury, decadence occasioned by, 8, 11, 34, 153, 348.

Lwoff, Prince George, Russian minister, 123, 133.

McAdoo, William Gibbs, secretary of the treasury, 323.

McClellan, George Brinton, mayor of New York, 221.

McCormick, Cyrus Hall, member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92.

McKinley, William, American president, 185, 188, 194, 198, 219 f., 221, 222 ff., 226, 232, 279, 280, 283, 323.

McKinley Tariff, the (1890), 193.

Madero, Francisco, Mexican revolutionary president, 332.

Madison, James, American president, 17.

Madison Square Garden, address at, 33-38.

Maine, 315.

Manchus, the, 34.

Manhattan Casino, New York, address at, 259-275.

Manila, 200.

Manila Bay, 53.

Mann, Horace, American educator, 31.

Mansfield, Lord, British jurist, 209.

Marat, Jean Paul, French revolutionist, 223.

Marbury *v.* Madison, 295.

Mark of Brandenburg, the, 74.

Marne, battle of the (1914), 330.

Marshall, John, American jurist, 206, 209, 263, 294, 295.

Maryland, 315.

Mason, James Murray, Confederate commissioner, 324.

Massachusetts, 315, 319.

Matinées Royales, the, 72, note.

Maximilian, emperor of Mexico, 324.

Maximum and minimum tariff rates, 290.

Meat combination, the, 210.

Meat Inspection act, the, 213, 236, 280.

Méneval, Baron de, private secretary to Napoleon, 72, note.

Mercier, Cardinal, 8 f.

Mexican War, the, 14, 189.

Mexico, 17, 21, 30, 78, 189, 200, 237, 240, 324, 325, 326, 344; failure of President Wilson's policy in, 331-337, 346 f.

Michael, Russian grand duke, 90.

Militia, training of the, 288.

Militia Act, the, of 1792, 12 f.

Milukoff, Paul, Russian minister, 91 f.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 330.

Milwaukee Refrigerator Transit case, the, 213.

Mission to Russia, American, 87-182.

Mississippi River, the, 190 f.

Mississippi Valley, the, 191.

Missouri, 189, 257, 338, 340.

Mitchel, John Purroy, mayor of New York, 45, 154.

Monetary Commission, the, 283 f.

Monroe, James, American president, 21.

Monroe Doctrine, the, 21 f., 26, 30, 36, 40, 53, 71, 75 f., 77, 324.

Morse, Charles Wyman, American financier, 272.

Morton, Oliver Perry, American statesman, 279.

Moscow, addresses at, 109-129.

Moscow Duma, the, address before, 111-116.

Moscow People's Bank, the, 178; address at, 125 f.

Mott, John R., member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92.

Murphy, Charles F., Tammany leader, 216, 218, 267, 268, 274.

Murray, William, *see* Mansfield, Lord.

Nadault de Buffon, Henri, 73, note.

Napoleon, 13, 72, note, 94.

Napoleon III, *see* Louis Napoleon.

Napoleonism, 223.

Narodny Bank, the, 125 f., 178.

National Arts Club, the, 154.

National Bank act, the, 256.

National defense, delay of President Wilson's administration in preparing for, 326-331, 346.

National evolution, principle of, 20 f., 29 f., 36, 76.

National Guard, the, 14 f., 16, 23, 330, 331, 346.

National Institute of Art and Letters, the, 96, 97.

National rights, how defended, 35.

National Security League, the, 11.

National Sugar Refining Company, the, 271.

Naturalization frauds, 233.

Navy, the, 288, 329, 330.
 Navy Department, the, 232.
 Nazuvaeskaya, address at, 147.
 Nebraska, 189, 349.
 Nekrasoff, Nicholas, Russian minister, 48.
 "Nervous and excited," 329.
 Netherlands, the, 237.
 Newfoundland Fisheries, the, 238.
 New Jersey, 211, 315.
 Newlands Irrigation Act, the, 191.
 New Mexico, 331.
 New Nationalism, the, 262 ff.
 Newspapers, traitorous, 52, 177.
 New York, city, 218, 305.
 New York, state, 185, 191, 225, 227;
 address on the state campaign of 1910,
 259-275; address at the Republican
 state convention of 1914, 301-322.
 New York Central Railroad, the, 271.
 New York City Hall, address at, 154-
 160.
New York Journal, quoted, 219-224.
 New York, New Haven, and Hartford
 Railroad, the, 213, 256.
 New York Republican Club, address
 before the, 39-44.
 New Zealand, 232.
 Nicaragua, 193.
 Nicholas II, emperor of Russia, abdication of, 89 f.
 North America, 21, 54, 55.
 North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration, the, 238, 289.
 Northeastern boundary controversy, 14.
 Northern Securities Company, the, 210,
 211, 221.
 Norway, 237.
 Office, desire for, as a cohesive force, 258.
 Oklahoma, 211.
 'Open door,' the, 200.
 Oregon boundary settlement, the, 14.
 Oregon country, the, 152.
 Orient, the, 29, 187, 200.
 Pacific Ocean, the, 22, 81, 85, 166, 232,
 289.
 Pacific railroads, the, 256.
 Pacifist meetings, 177.
 Pakrovsky, Russian minister, 166.
 Panama, 22, 195.
 Panama, Isthmus of, 231, 289.
 Panama Canal, the, 22, 30, 36, 40, 53, 76,
 186, 195, 199, 231, 239, 248, 289.
 Pan American Conference, Third, at Rio
 de Janeiro, 239.
 Panic of 1907, the, 230 f.
 Paper manufacturers, combination of,
 210.
 Parcel-post conventions, 232.
 Paris, 223.
 Parker, Alton Brooks, American jurist,
 199, 221, 243, 272.
 Parties, government by, 189, 277 f.,
 306 ff.; address on the duty of the
 Republican party in the war, 39-44.
 Partisanship, political, 42.
 Payne-Aldrich bill, the, 282, 290.
 Peace, not maintained by the surrender
 of just rights, 325.
 Pennsylvania, 191, 315.
 Pennsylvania Railroad, the, 257.
 Peonage, 233.
 Peru, address before Russian soldiers at,
 145 f.
 Pershing, John Joseph, American general, 137.
 Persia, 34, 146.
Persia, the, 78.
 Petrograd, 94, 117, 156, 158, 162, 170,
 175; addresses at, 98-108, 132-144.
 Philippine Islands, the, 186 f., 199.
 Philippine Legislative Assembly, the,
 231.
 Pious Fund, the, 200.
 Place in the sun, Germany's, 76.
 Poland, 73, 89; address on, 142 ff.
 Poles, 143, 144.
 Population, increase of, 29.
 Populist Democrats, 198.
 Populistic doctrines, 190.
 Porto Rico, 193.
 Portsmouth, Treaty of, 240.
 Portugal, 75, 237.
 Postal savings system, 253 f., 288.
 Post Office Department, the, 232.

Princeton, New Jersey, 222.
 Principles of democracy, address on the, 132-135.
 Progressive party, the, disappearance of, 315 f.
 Prussia, 39, 74, 75, 76.
 Public debt, the, 197.
 Public domain, offenses against the, 235.
 Public opinion, power of, 6.
 Public Service Commission laws, 269.
 Pulaski, Casimir, Polish-American general, 142.
 Pure food law, the, 236, 280, 286.
 Quebec, 50.
 Railroad brotherhoods, the, increase of wages for, 341-344, 348.
 Railroad-rates act, the, 213, 279.
 Railroad employés, orders of, 286.
 Railroads, government direction of, 107, 119; government ownership of, 255 ff.
 Railway mails, weighing of, 232.
 Rebates, secret, 200, 207, 212, 229, 284.
 Reciprocity, 193 f.
 Red Cross, the, 119.
 Reed, Thomas Brackett, American congressman, 221 f., 246, 247.
 Regeneration, power of, in the Russian character, 50.
 Reign of law, the, 35.
 Republican party, duty of the, 39-44; the campaign of 1904, 185-201; of 1906, 203-226; of 1908, 227-258; of 1910, 259-275; address as chairman of the Republican national convention at Chicago, June 18, 1912, 277-295; speech notifying President Taft of his renomination, 297 ff.; the campaign of 1914, 301-322; of 1916, 323-349.
 Retail Grocers' Association, the, 210.
 Riga, 146.
 Rio de Janeiro, 239.
 Roberts, Lord, British general, 49.
 Rocky Mountains, the, 210.
 Rodzianko, president of the Russian Duma, 138.
 Romanoff dynasty, the, overthrow of, 89 ff.
 Rome, 34, 54, 74, 115.
 Roosevelt, Theodore, American president, 76, 185, 188, 207 f., 222, 225, 226, 227, 232, 242, 243, 249, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, 265 f., 270, 279, 280, 284, 285, 315.
 Rumania, 74, 79.
 Rural free delivery of mails, 200, 232, 247 f., 288.
 Russell, Charles Edward, member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92.
 Russia, 21, 22, 26, 30, 31, 37, 42, 43, 71, 72, 79, 210, 289; the American mission to Russia, 87-182.
 Russian-American Chamber of Commerce, address before the, 105-108.
 Safety-appliance law, the, 214, 286.
 Saint Lawrence county, New York, 305.
 St. Louis, Missouri, 210, 257, 330.
 St. Louis convention, the (1904), 185.
 Salt combination, the, 210.
 Salute to the flag, demanded, 335 ff.
 San Domingo, 193, 239 f.
 San Francisco, 238.
 San José scale, the, 250.
 San Salvador, island, 323.
 Sans Souci, 72, note.
 Saratoga, battles of (1777), 17.
 Saratoga convention, the, 264.
 Saratoga Springs, New York, 57, 63, 227, 301.
 Scandinavians, 143.
 Schurman, Jacob Gould, university president, 265.
 Scotland, 26.
 Scott, Major-General Hugh Lenox, member of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 92.
 "Scrap of paper," 40.
 Seattle, address at, 149-153.
 Sedan, battle of (1870), 325.
 Senate, the, 24.
 Senators, direct election of, 244 f.
 Servia, 20, 21, 25, 26, 60, 71, 72, 73, 181.

Seward, William Henry, American statesman, 279.
Shepard, Edward Morse, American lawyer, 220.
Sheridan, Philip Henry, American general, 324.
Sherman, James Schoolcraft, American congressman and vice-president, 215.
Sherman, William Tecumseh, American general, 324.
Sherman Act, the, 284.
Shiloh, battle of (1862), 17.
Short ballot, the, 319 f.
Skene, case of, 267 f.
Slavery, 73, 293.
Slidell, John, Confederate commissioner, 324.
Social Associated Committees of Moscow, the, address before, 109 f.
Socialists, 156, 163, 170, 171, 172 ff.
South Africa, 50.
South America, 21, 22, 29, 36, 54 f., 219, 232, 257.
South Dakota, 315.
Southern Pacific Railroad Company, the, 214.
South Seas, the, 54.
Spain, 14, 75, 193, 222, 237.
Spirit of America, need of arousing, 348.
Spiritual succession, 349.
Standard Oil combination, the, 211, 284 f.
Standard Wall Paper Company, the, 273 f.
State exigencies, supposed superior to the rules of morality and to individual rights, 19 f., 54, 72.
Statesmanship, principles of, 72.
Steel Corporation, the, 285.
Simson, Henry Lewis, candidate for governor of New York, 261 f., 265, 269, 270 ff.
Stone, William Joel, American senator, 338.
Story, Joseph, American jurist, 294.
Straus, Oscar Solomon, American diplomat, 154.
"Strict accountability," 326.
Submarines, 17, 52, 107, 119, 131, 137, 329.
Sumner, Charles, American statesman, 279.
Supreme Court, the, 210, 213, 214, 257, 284, 285.
Supreme Court, the, of New York State, 218.
Sussex, the, 78.
Sutherland, George, American senator, 169.
Sweden, 237.
Switzerland, 237.
Taft, William Howard, American president, 200, 242, 249, 255, 257, 259, 260, 261, 265, 266, 270, 275, 332, 333, 338; review of his administration, 279-290; speech notifying him of his renomination, 297 ff.
Taggart, Thomas, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, 221.
Tammany Hall, 215, 216 f., 218, 267, 268, 269.
Tampico, 335.
Tariff, protective, 191 ff., 250 f., 256, 272 ff., 280, 310 f., 337-341.
Tariff Commission, the, 310, 338.
Tariff Commission bill, the, 282, 310 f., 338.
Terestchenko, Michael, Russian minister, 48; address of, 101-104.
Texas, 331.
Thirty Years' War, the, 6.
Thomas, Augustus, Mr. Root's letter to, 96 f.
Thompson, James, Republican candidate for state comptroller in New York, 267.
Tierra del Fuego, 29.
Tilden, Samuel Jones, American statesman, 206.
Timber thieves, 233.
Tobacco Trust, the, 211, 284.
Tokyo, Japan, 239.
"Too proud to fight," 328.
Towne, Charles Arnette, American congressman, 220.

Trade Commission, the, 313.
 Treason, 49, 50, 52, 68, 69, 177.
 Treasury Department, the, 284.
 Treaties: Fur Seal, 289; with Japan, 289 f.; Portsmouth, 240; Webster-Ashburton (1842), 14; of Westphalia (1648), 82; general treaties of arbitration, 237 f.
 Triple Alliance, the, 49.
 Troy, New York, 267.
 Tseratelli, Russian minister, 48.
 Turkey, 95.
 Tyler, John, American president, 198.
 U-boats, *see* Submarines.
 Underwood, Oscar W., American congressman, 340.
 Underwood tariff, the, 340 f.
 Union League Club, address before the (March 20, 1917), 27-32; (August 15, 1917), 45-55.
 United States Bank, the, 189.
 United States of America, the, and the war, 3-86; sends a Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia, 87-182; political campaigns from 1904 to 1916, 183-349.
 Universal Brotherhood of the Proletariat, proposed, 172.
 Universal military service, the original theory of the American government, 12 f.; occultation of, 13 f.; need of, 63.
 Universities, German, 75.
 Ural Mountains, the, 166.
 Utica, New York, address at, 203-226.
 Venezuela, 53, 76, 200, 239.
 Vera Cruz, seizure of, 335, 336.
 Villa, Francisco, Mexican chief, 333, 336, 337.
 Vladivostok, 94, 171.
 'Wall Street Cabinet,' the, 220.
 War Department, the, 231.
 War Industries Committee at Moscow, the, address before, 117-122.
 War of 1812, the, 16.
 Washington, 17, 28, 62, 78, 121, 217, 243, 257, 274, 275, 308.
 Washington, George, American president, 224.
 Watered stock, 208.
 Webster, Daniel, American statesman, 206.
 Western Transit Company, the, 270 f.
 West Indies, the, 22, 193.
 Westphalia, Peace of (1648), 82.
 West Shore Railroad, the, 256.
 West Virginia, 315.
 Whig party, the, 198.
 White House, the, 17.
 Wholesale Grocers' Association, the, 210.
 William II, emperor of Germany, 53, 73, 76, 79.
 Williams, Frank Martin, state engineer of New York, 267.
 Williams, John Sharp, American congressman, 221.
 Wilson, Woodrow, American president, 9, 24 f., 28, 33, 39, 41, 42, 65, 66, 68, 94, 98, 100, 101, 154; review of his first administration, 323-348; his address to the Provisional Government of Russia, 92 ff.
 Wilson tariff law, the, 197, 251, 273.
 Winter Palace, the, 175.
 Woodruff, Timothy Lester, lieutenant-governor of New York, 220.
 Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, 162, 171.
 Wright, Luke E., Philippine commissioner, 200.
 Yellow journals, 215, 218-226.
 Yorktown, capture of (1781), 17.
 Young Men's Christian Association, the, 119.
 Zemstvos, 164, 178.
 Zemstvo Union, the, address before, 123 f.
 Zimmermann, Alfred, German minister, 30.

PRINTED AT
THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.

